

shown a sincere desire to settle the Vietnamese war by negotiation at the conference table. By indicating our willingness to negotiate, however, we have made it plain to the Communists that we are not going to surrender as some in our Nation apparently would have us do under the misguided view that it is possible to negotiate on an honorable basis with the Communists.

We have in the past several months demonstrated to the world that we will accept an honorable diplomatic solution to the Vietnamese war. Our efforts have been met with scorn on the part of North Vietnam. Communist China has gone to every length to vilify and attack the United States.

With China at her back North Vietnam has not indicated a willingness to negotiate. Instead, North Vietnam has increased military activity on all fronts. Our current military buildup in South Vietnam, therefore, is to meet this military challenge.

The United States has not had the support it deserves from the free nations of the world in the Vietnamese war. Countries that the United States has helped to preserve their independence economically and militarily during the past 20 years have openly criticized our efforts to preserve freedom in South Vietnam.

Several of these governments today stand protected behind the shield of American military might in Europe. Our resources and military power have enabled these nations to have the highest standard of living in their history. While urging the United States to abandon its commitment to help South Vietnam, they utterly fail to realize that if the United States were to abandon its commitment to preserve freedom in Europe they would fall victims to communism within a very short time.

Our Government has been disturbed over the attitude of many of these countries. I am concerned over not only their political policies which hamper our efforts to win

the Vietnamese war, but I am gravely concerned over the persistent foreign trade between these countries and North Vietnam, and particularly with Communist China. It is no secret that much of the material reaching Communist China from the free world finds its way into North Vietnam.

My friends, total free world trade to Communist China and North Vietnam in 1964 amounted to \$989.4 million. At the same time the free world imported from Communist China and North Vietnam \$1,204.4 million. This enormous trade between free world countries and Communist China and North Vietnam is enabling the Communist machine to destroy the liberties of free people in southeast Asia.

The ports of North Vietnam and Red China are clogged with ships flying the flags of England, France, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, Austria, and even our Latin American neighbors. I believe it is imperative that our Nation adopt a stern and realistic policy with our allies in the matter of trade with Communist China and North Vietnam.

We should make it plain to these nations that they cannot expect to enjoy our military protection and our foreign aid dollars while engaging in trade that results in death of our young men in southeast Asia and destruction of the liberties of free people.

There are those in our Nation who cringe from a possible confrontation with Red China. The United States has never deliberately attacked any nation. If war with Red China comes, it will come through direct intervention of that country in the Vietnamese war. In the event of such an occurrence the United States should not spare any of its material and military resources to destroy Chinese aggression.

It was my privilege last fall to visit Formosa and to talk with the great Chinese Nationalist leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. I also visited Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong. I had a first-

hand look at the vast and complex military and economic problems with which we are confronted in southeast Asia.

We have an awesome responsibility, and the task that lies ahead of us will demand great sacrifices on the part of our people. The President and our Government deserve the support of the American people in our effort in southeast Asia.

In our exercise of the right of freedom of the press, of the news media, of the pulpit, and of our educational institutions we should be very careful to avoid doing those things which will give aid and comfort to our enemies and prolong a conflict that will bring about the tragic loss of life.

As one who spent over 3 years in combat during World War II, and as the father of a son of military age, I know something of the anguish, apprehension, and worry that exists in the minds of the American people today.

Our country has not asked for the responsibilities and obligations which weigh so heavily upon us in the struggle for the preservation of Christian civilization. As the most powerful and most enlightened nation on earth the responsibilities and obligations have been thrust upon us. We must fulfill the demands that this period in history has placed upon us. If we fail, our prosperity will become the slaves of communism.

My friends, I want to say in conclusion that I am proud of the record that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has made in the cause of national security and the furtherance of our democratic institutions. It is a comforting thought to know that the VFW is growing year by year in membership.

While ever watchful over the welfare of our veterans, the VFW has strongly supported the broader aspects of our national life. As long as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other great patriotic organizations founded on similar principles exists, the United States will continue to hold high the torch of liberty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. J. William Hough, minister, Fredericksburg Methodist Church, Fredericksburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the wisdom and the courage of George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate today. Here, in this Chamber where the Senators of the Nation which he led in its infancy, meet to debate and to make decisions affecting the lives of millions of Thy children, we pray that they may be responsive to Thee, who art the source of this Nation's goodness and greatness.

We confess, our Father, that though we imprint our currency with the words, "In God We Trust," we have often been more prone to place our confidence in our judgment than in Thine and to rely more on physical might than spiritual strength. For this strong tendency to develop our military muscles rather than our spiritual fiber, forgive us.

In this day when this Nation is faced with decisions which involve the fate of mankind, we pray that every Member of the U.S. Senate and every official of our Government, from the President to the

latest recruit in the Armed Forces or the last clerk employed, will truly seek to know Thy will, who art the ultimate authority. Our limited understanding of Thy purposes convinces us that every person on this earth is precious in Thy sight and that we are all members of Thy universal family. We earnestly pray that Thou wilt motivate us to negotiate our differences rather than to seek to kill those who differ with us.

On this day, then, when the normal business of Government is largely suspended in honor of George Washington, to whom as to a father the early leaders of these United States turned to set the course for the ship of state, grant that all in positions of authority and all who work behind the scenes to assist them, may look to Thee, the Father of us all, for the course Thou wouldst have us set as we sail through the troubled waters of the present into the uncertain latitudes of the future. And, having been given the course by Thee, help us to maintain Thy course rather than change the orders according to our limited vision.

All this we pray in the spirit of the one who prayed: *Not My will, but Thine be done*, even Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, Washing-

ton's Farewell Address will be read by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], heretofore designated for that purpose by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. METCALF advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past

kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criti-

cism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to

enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyments of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those

broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which

they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged

authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions;—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country;—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false

alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connec-

tions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent

felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and

powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respect-

able defense posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as

far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, pursuant to the order entered yesterday, Monday, February 21, 1966, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1966.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Frank A. Tobey, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any nation.—Proverbs 14: 34.

Almighty and Eternal God our Heavenly Father, we, Thy humble servants, do give Thee grateful thanks for this great land of liberty—founded upon righteousness and favored from its beginning by Thy wisdom and power.

As we celebrate today, the birth of George Washington, the Father and first President of this great Nation, keep us mindful of our unique heritage and of the loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice of our forebears.

So fasten our fortunes to Thy purpose and so fire our minds with a vision of Thy righteousness that our works may be just, that our children and the children of all nations, for generations to come, shall rise up and call us blessed.

Through Him who is the Lord of all life, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5831. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose

deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 14, 1966, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mrs. MINK read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and

critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country; for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will

acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyments of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is broils and wars between themselves, of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continu-

ance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute: they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and ma-

ture deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so

extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of

that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage,

and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and

confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as

experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred

to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by section 205 of title II of the Dual Compensation Act—Public Law 88-448, approved August 19, 1964—I am transmitting a comprehensive report of the operations under that title of the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 21, 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the message and accompanying papers are referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL RESERVE ACTION ON DISCOUNT RATES

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, after the stirring delivery of Washington's Farewell Address by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], it is with reluctance that I take the well of the House to disturb our unity in looking at our past to discuss something in which I am sure there is no unity—to discuss one of the problems of our present. I speak of the action of the Federal Reserve in increasing the discount rate which has caused an increase in interest rates. I spoke yesterday on the record about this matter, Mr. Speaker. I think the evidence that is before us now indicates the Federal Reserve in taking the action they did—and when they did—did not deter inflation but as a matter of fact assured that inflation would be increasingly a part of today's problems. I think the record will show that if the Fed expected to settle the problem of inflation, they are just as much of a settling influence in the problem of inflation as a hound dog would as a participant at a rabbit picnic.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that today's article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak be printed at this point in the RECORD because they have some very excellent remarks in this regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

MORE FED MEDICINE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The fact that the Federal Reserve Board is intent on still another interest rate boost is bringing President Johnson face to face again with the historic question of whether he or the banking industry shall determine major economic policy.

This will be one of the many uncomfortable issues to be tossed at Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. (Joe) Fowler when he appears before the Senate Finance Committee Friday. One Democratic Senator—EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota—plans to frame the issue in the form of a touchy question.

Does the President need standby economic powers, including statutory authority to overrule the Federal Reserve Board, which serves as America's central bank and has always been dominated by commercial bankers?

The administration is seeking no such power and would prefer not to have the question asked. Yet, the question of the Fed's cherished independence from the executive branch is once again critical as a result of the inflation scare spawned by the Vietnam war.

The interest rate boost decreed by the Fed 3 months ago in defiance of Mr. Johnson has failed completely as an anti-inflationary device, just as critics predicted. Instead, it started a chain reaction in interest rate boosts. And though orthodox bankers deny it, this increase in the cost of money has been as inflationary as an increase in the cost of steel.

Working on the theory that if the first dose of medicine doesn't work try a second, the Fed is geared for another discount rate boost within 60 days. Whether this will really stop inflation is debatable. It will, however, escalate the runaway cost of money.

Indeed, bankers are privately demanding another boost in the discount rate—the rate

charged by the Fed for money loaned to the banks—to justify their own increases in money rates to astronomical levels.

This raises the question of the indistinct, delicate relations between the White House and the Fed. Mr. Johnson came off second best to Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin last December when the Fed raised the discount rate without consulting the President.

Some high administration officials now believe Mr. Johnson made a political mistake in publicly disagreeing with Martin and should not oppose the forthcoming second discount rate boost—or still a third increase later this year.

This caution shows up in Mr. Johnson's failure to fill a vacancy on the Reserve Board created January 31, when the term of C. Canby Balderston, a Martin ally, ended. Although the President could take control of the Board by filling that vacancy, he has let Balderston remain as a lame duck.

The basic reason for this is Mr. Johnson's inability to find a Board member who will support his position but not anger Martin to the point of resigning. Thus, the White House has turned down a suggestion for the job forwarded by a prominent Democratic Senator on grounds that he is an "easy money" man.

While accepting Martin's private recommendation that the new Board member not be an economist, the President also has ruled out a commercial banker. What he wants is a moderately liberal businessman (though Assistant Secretary of Commerce Andrew Brimmer, who would be the Board's first Negro member, is under consideration).

Yet, the identity of Balderston's replacement begs the question that Senator McCarthy plans to raise in the Finance Committee: Why should the President not have the power to regulate national monetary policy as he has the power to send 200,000 men to Vietnam; why should Presidential authority stop short of controlling interest rates?

Whatever Secretary Fowler's answer to these questions, it will transcend the simplest debate over tight versus easy money. The fundamental issue is whether the President can control a Vietnam inflation without ending 6 years of economic growth. If he permits the Fed to raise the discount rate again this spring without a serious effort to block it, he will say implicitly that the job can't be done.

TRANSPORTATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON THE ECONOMY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the Congress I have been greatly interested in transportation and its impact upon the economy and national security of the United States.

As the Representative of a highly industrialized district I have been particularly concerned over the problems existing in connection with rail and highway freight transportation. The severe shortage of boxcars in the country is causing undue hardship on the shippers and manufacturers in my congressional district.

It is a problem which must be solved by the railroad industry and the Government if our economy is to continue to advance and if we are to be certain that we will have an adequate supply of boxcars of all types in the event of a great national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is an ironic fact that the Nation had more boxcars in 1925 than it has today. In that year 2,414,083 boxcars were in service in the Nation. At the close of 1965 only 1,547,307 boxcars were in service.

A 1925 boxcar had an average capacity of 44.8 tons. A boxcar in 1965 had an average capacity of approximately 57 tons. The greater carrying capacity of the boxcar today, however, does not offset the total loss in tonnage resulting from the continued shrinking of our boxcar fleet.

During 1965 the Nation's railroads placed in operation 87,826 new cars, which was a greater number than had been placed in service in either of the 2 previous years. Unfortunately, however, 78,661 cars were retired from service. These figures give a graphic illustration of what is taking place in the Nation in regard to our freight car supply.

Some of the Nation's railroads have made a sincere effort to respond to the demand made upon them by industry for freight cars. Severe car shortages, however, have been experienced during the past several years. In an attempt to temporarily solve the car shortage in certain areas of the country the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued car service orders which have required railroads to make a part of their boxcar fleet available to other roads more severely affected by the car shortage.

In other words, the ICC has been shifting cars from one hard-pressed road to another road in a more serious situation by reason of the car shortage. The car service orders, however, are no answer to the problem. It is imperative that legislation be passed by the Congress to assure that the railroads will maintain at all times an adequate supply of freight cars. The economy demands it, and it is absolutely necessary in the interest of national security.

The railroads which have kept abreast of their needs for cars are not to be blamed for the car shortage. Heavily taxed and confronted with many problems involving labor, regulation, and tremendous passenger deficits, some of the roads have not kept up with the boxcar demand. In the interest of national security and the demands of our everyday economy I feel that some thought should be given to helping the railroads which have tried to keep up to date, overcome the boxcar shortage through long-term loans, tax credits, or other financial assistance in proper cases.

Within the past several days I have had numerous contacts from manufacturers in my congressional district with reference to the recent ICC service order requiring the Southern Railway System to deliver 350 boxcars per week to St. Louis, Mo., in order that the cars

may be distributed on western railroads suffering a severe boxcar shortage. They are the innocent victims of the present crisis.

Under the dynamic leadership of D. W. Brosnan, the Southern has revolutionized the railroad industry in the Nation. The Southern has made tremendous strides in providing better and cheaper service for its shippers. Thousands of new boxcars incorporating the very latest technological advances have been placed in service on the Southern under Mr. Brosnan's leadership.

The Southern has not raided its neighboring railroads for boxcars. Yet the requirement that the Southern be made to deliver 350 of its cars per week to western railroads will compound an already serious car shortage existing on the railroad. The result is that shippers and manufacturers in my congressional district will experience undue delays in the movement of their shipments.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation. I feel that the constituents of my colleagues have experienced similar situations in connection with the railroads in their areas. I am hopeful that the appropriate committees of the Congress will look into this matter and report legislation that will bring relief to the railroads, the manufacturers, and above all, to the average American whose security and economic well-being is vitally affected.

U.S. ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA CONSISTENT WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been a number of charges leveled against the legality of American actions in Vietnam.

Yesterday, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, by unanimous vote, answered these charges by affirming the legality of the U.S. participation in Vietnam under international law, the United Nations Charter, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

I thoroughly agree with the bar's resolution, which states:

Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party; and

Whereas in the course of these hearings it has been suggested that an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Bar Association, That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of

the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO THE OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF JUDGES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee heard testimony on the problem created by corruption, laxity, incompetence, or senility on the Federal bench. There was emphasis on the importance of public respect for our system of laws, and the grave danger that is presented when a cloud of corruption or incompetence hangs over the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Bernard G. Segal, of Philadelphia, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure, and Compensation, put it this way:

It is axiomatic that of all our historic American traditions, none is more basic than the citizen's respect for the law. This respect requires confidence in the institutions of the law, and in the men who administer them. The citizen's esteem for his courts and the judges who preside in them is of the very essence of our kind of society.

Mr. Segal, Judge John Biggs, Jr., the chairman of the judicial conference committee on court administration, and Mr. Joseph Borkin, Washington attorney and author of the book, "The Corrupt Judge," were in agreement that impeachment is the only remedy available today for action against judicial misconduct.

Both Mr. Borkin and the chairman of the subcommittee emphasized the serious problem that has arisen in Oklahoma where the Judicial Council of the 10th Judicial Circuit made an attempt to bar Judge Stephen S. Chandler from handling cases because it was stated he was "either unwilling or unable" to perform his judicial functions adequately.

Mr. Borkin, a man with an impressive background in the study of the problems of corruption and misconduct in the judiciary, pointed out that Judge Chandler, in return, has made serious charges of attempted bribery and other misconduct against two other judges—Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals, and Luther Bohanon, district judge, U.S. District Court for the Eastern, Northern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

Mr. Borkin stressed that this dispute in Oklahoma has been an upsetting factor in the Federal courts in Oklahoma since 1962, and he declared that these charges should not be permitted to stand. He emphasized that there can be no compromise short of a full investigation to clear the judges or to force their removal.

I agree with Mr. Borkin that great damage has been done because the courts, the executive branch, and the Congress have taken no effective steps to clear up this scandalous situation. I have waited patiently for months, and I have hoped that the Justice Department, the courts, or the Congress would initiate or suggest a proper legal investigation to clear the air and put an end to this outrageous situation in the judiciary in the 10th circuit.

There has been no effective action taken, or even started. Therefore, I am today instituting the only action available to try to get to the bottom of this.

I have introduced a House resolution authorizing and directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the conduct of the three Federal judges in Oklahoma involved in this controversy. Upon its finding of fact, the House Judiciary Committee would be empowered to institute impeachment proceedings or make any other recommendations it deems proper.

The committee would also be empowered to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents—including financial statements, contracts, and bank accounts—as it deems necessary.

The resolution in no way establishes the guilt of the principals involved. It is necessary to the launching of an investigation for the purpose of determining the facts essential to an intelligent conclusion and eliminating the cloud now hanging over the Federal judiciary.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 739

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to inquire into and investigate the official conduct of Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals, Stephen S. Chandler, chief judge, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and Luther Bohanon, district judge, U.S. District Court for the Eastern, Northern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma, to determine whether in the opinion of said committee the said judges or any of them have been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Said committee shall report its findings to the House, together with such resolutions of impeachment or other recommendations as it deems proper.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents—including financial statements, contracts, and bank accounts—to administer the customary oaths to witnesses, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary.

DOWNFALL OF U.S. MERCHANT MARINE STRENGTH

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the downfall of U.S. merchant marine strength may be closer at hand even than many of us in Congress have been indicating. News of an increase in cargo insurance rates on the seas could mean that U.S. ships would be virtually eliminated from the common carrier shipping market.

The major shipping insurance firms in London have now advised that insurance rates on cargoes shipped in vessels more than 20 years old should be increased by about 100 percent. The word is going out that only newer ships should be used.

As pointed out by many Congressmen recently, our Government has allowed our merchant shipping fleet to go downhill steadily over the past several years until now a large percentage of U.S. ships afloat are more than 20 years old.

The new rates could go into effect as early as March 1, a week from today. Insurance firms do not legally have to follow the London lead, but they can be expected to do so.

The penalty rate would mean an 8-percent increase in a shipper's total bill on one cargo, according to one example mentioned by American shippers yesterday as they prepared to make an effort to ward off the increase.

This would be enough to divert a great volume of shipments from American ships to the generally newer fleets of other nations such as Japan, Russia, Norway, and Germany.

And still our cries for a greater American merchant marine go unheeded.

According to my understanding, this country would have to build new ships at a rate of 135 every year if we were to avoid a major disaster to our merchant shipping capability. Even without the increased insurance rates on older ships, U.S. shipping is a sick industry.

The problem is highlighted by the fact that President Johnson's budget calls for the construction of only 13 new ships in the coming fiscal year. We are treated to the spectacle of the Secretary of Defense saying that our merchant fleet is adequate, when obviously it is not.

If the merchant fleet were an ordinary domestic business, there would be small cause for concern. But our national security is at stake. The merchant marine is a vital arm of national defense. And this is not a new or superficial idea.

It has been acknowledged by the Congress beginning in 1936. It is understood today in most other nations. It is known here in Congress today. But it has been tragically overlooked by the administration.

We face today an absolutely vital need for attaining a U.S. merchant marine philosophy. As proposals for consideration, I want to call attention to the 12 steps I put forth as suggestions in my remarks of February 16, and to other ideas which have been advanced in recent months by those both in this Congress and elsewhere who understand the importance of regaining strength in our merchant marine.

FEDERAL TAX POLICY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently delivered a paper I prepared on Federal tax policy before the Missouri Oil Jobbers Association in St. Louis. Many people have asked to have a copy of it and perhaps it will serve a purpose to have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly, I am doing so.

I think the main point I would like to hammer home, if I could, is that the tax cut of 1964 was successful because it followed classical tax policy. It did not follow the policies being advocated by the new economists.

The point of difference between the two schools of thought is fundamental. It shows up in expenditure policy. The classical tax theory starts on the premise that our tax rates are so high they are impeding economic growth and that a decrease in the rates will broaden the base which will bring in greater revenue, provided this beneficial result is not impaired by too much interim deficit being financed by issuing more Federal debt securities in context of the Federal debt already extant. If the deficit to be financed is too great it will have to be monetized, which would result in price inflation and so rob the economy of any real growth and, for that matter, any real increase in aggregate purchasing power, let alone the structural damage it would cause.

The theory of the new economics, as I understand it, is to increase aggregate demand in the society by decreasing taxes but at the same time continuing the rate of increase in governmental spending. The inflationary forces feared by some, they argue, will be absorbed through utilizing the idle plant capacity and the unemployed within the society.

I advanced a rebuttal to this theory in 1964 on a pragmatic basis. I argued that what the new economists identified as idle plant capacity in this era of automation was largely inefficient and obsolete plant capacity and that the unemployed were largely those with few marketable skills. I did not argue that you could not get roast pork by burning down the barn, but I argued that pursuing that course destroyed a great deal of important and basic economic structure within the society and, anyway, there was a much more efficient way to get roast pork—the unemployed employed—namely through training and retraining.

Be that as it may, the issue was centered on the Republican motion to amend the tax bill of 1964 to make it effective only if the Federal governmental expenditures were held to \$97 billion for fiscal 1964 and to \$98 billion for fiscal 1965. Although the administration amidst great fanfare defeated this amendment, President Johnson then proceeded to follow its basic philosophy.

Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were \$97.7 billion and for fiscal 1965 they were \$96.5, \$0.8 billion less than the average set forth in the defeated amendment.

Two things have distracted the public's and Congress' attention from this important history.

First. The President continued to increase his requests from the Congress for spending power and Congress gave it to him. This is what received practically all the attention from the news media. The President's power to spend increased rapidly, but he did not increase his spending; he merely increased his carryover powers to spend.

Second. The dialog of both the new economists and many critics of the Johnson administration aided in this obfuscation. The new economists kept talking as if their theory was being tested. The critics of the Johnson administration kept talking about President Johnson as the big spender. Both points were untrue.

However, now the theory of the new economists is being tested. The test began in September 1965 when the expenditure rates zoomed from an annual rate of \$97.3 to where it is now about \$112 billion. It is unfortunate for them that the test is occurring when plant utilization has gone over 90 percent and unemployment has gone to 4 percent.

However, they are now talking about tax increases and the Congress is going to comply at least by eliminating part of the tax cut which was enacted last year.

The new economists' tax increase theory to produce sustainable economic growth and maximum employment is as wrong as was their tax cut theory. Our Federal tax rates even after the cuts of 1964 and 1965 are still so high they are impeding economic growth. An increase in rates will further impede economic growth, and the tax base. If price stability is maintained, the tax collections for the balance of fiscal 1966 and certainly for fiscal 1967 will be far below the estimates projected in the President's budget message this January. The only way out for the new economists, and it is a dangerous short term way out, is to forget about maintaining price stability.

There is only one proper course of action—it is utilization of fiscal policy all right, but it relates to the expenditure side of the ledger and it means cutting the expenditure side so that neither tax increases nor additional Federal debt securities are necessary.

Fortunately, a careful review of Federal expenditure policies, foreign and domestic, will reveal that the social objectives of those programs are being defeated because we are flooding the engine with too much expenditures, not giving too lean a mixture. So expenditure restraint is correct both for aggregate Federal fiscal policy as well as for many of the specific Federal programs.

At present there is no indication that President Johnson intends to exercise expenditure restraint. I have only one small consolation to be derived from the President's new fiscal policy, that is his statement that he will ask to increase taxes, badly as he knows this will damage

the economy, rather than ask to have a greater load placed on the managers of the Federal debt. This is significant because even at this point the new economists are still arguing in public that we do not have to worry about the size of the Federal debt. Obviously, in private they are more worried about the consequences of the size of the Federal debt than they are about the consequences of increasing taxes. It is about time.

The paper on Federal tax policy is as follows:

FEDERAL TAX POLICY

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, St. Louis County, before the Missouri Oil Jobbers Association, Khorassan Room, Hotel Chase, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, February 14, 1966)

I appreciate that businessmen are not supposed to be concerned about philosophy and, for that matter, perhaps politicians aren't either. However, I am going to try to talk a little tax philosophy here today because, increasingly, business judgments are being altered by it.

It has been my observation over a number of years that business judgments increasingly are being made, not on the basis of economic considerations, but rather upon the Federal tax consequences.

This means that important business judgments are being made through the political mechanism of the society, rather than through the marketplace or private mechanisms. I suppose that human beings trained in or experienced in political science can make economic judgments from time to time, as soundly as those who are trained in or experienced in economics. However, common sense should tell us that in the long run the practicing economists, that is my euphemism for businessmen, can make more sound economic judgments per judgment to be made than can those in politics. Furthermore, the marketplace is a stern disciplinarian for the shoddy economist, while I am not so certain that the ballot box is quite as stern a disciplinarian for the shoddy politicians. It certainly is not so stern a disciplinarian for shoddy economic judgments, albeit it might exercise considerable restraint on shoddy political decisions.

There is an even more important reason for being concerned about those in politics making economic decisions in a society. It involves the very concept and, I would argue, the basic genius which has made our society successful in raising the standard of living to such high levels and across such a broad spread. I am referring to the concept that if the powers within a society are concentrated into the hands of a few people, no matter how well motivated or how intelligent, educated and wise they may be, in the long run this produces an erosion of human freedom and an ebbing of innovation in all fields of human endeavor, economics, art, science and, yes, even philosophy.

Accordingly, in 1789 when the full forest was not so hidden from the minds of those days by the luxuriance of the individual trees, we separated out and sought to balance off the powers of church from the powers of state, the military powers from civilian powers. And within government itself we divided its vast powers horizontally into legislative, judicial, and executive functions and vertically into Federal, State, and local governments, leaving the residuum of power, which was considerable, in the people. We did not seek, however, to separate out and balance off economic from political power, mainly, as I see it, because in those days economic power was vested in land holdings and with the wide open frontier in America there was little concentration of this power, whether in the private sector or in government.

As the 19th century unfolded, however, mass production moved economic power from land to machinery, and the corporate form of doing business provided a new form to concentrate this power. The political sector reacted by passing antitrust laws and establishing regulatory bodies to separate and balance out these powers. Government further sought—through election laws—to prevent concentrated economic power from moving too heavily into exercising political power.

In the latter part of the 20th century, perhaps we have not been sufficiently alert in recognizing the concentration of economic power in the hands of national union leaders and the need here to separate and balance off this power. Certainly we do not seem to be alert to what seems to me to be the greatest danger to human freedom of them all, concentrating economic power into the same hands that hold political power.

This apathy is difficult to understand in light of our recent experiences with the Nazi and Fascist states which, by definition, were social organizations concentrating economic and political power into the hands of the same small group of people. Indeed, they were called, and properly so, totalitarian states. And what happened to human freedom and innovation under such a concentration of power? Those who would argue that these were malevolent men who controlled the powers, rather than benevolent men, must certainly recognize the same results occur in the Communist states even if these oligarchists are deemed to be benevolently motivated. The flaw lies in concentrating power.

I think it is very important that Americans today rethink this philosophical tenet of the separation and balancing of powers within a society. Do they agree that a concentration of powers into the hands of any small group, no matter how well qualified and how well motivated, in the long run bodes ill for human freedom and human innovation from whence springs future progress?

In doing this rethinking to see whether or not they conclude that concentration of economic and political power in the same hands is, let us say, as dangerous in the latter part of the 20th century as it was feudal Europe where the vast free lands of a frontier were not present to dissipate economic power, they should also consider the quality of the economic judgments made. Are these judgments best made by those who specialize in economics, through the use of the marketplace mechanism, or by those who specialize in political science, utilizing the ballot box mechanism?

Now, having laid this groundwork, let me point to an area of debate going on today in the political area, in the Federal Congress, which directly relates to it. This debate is over fundamental Federal tax policy. Should Federal taxes be levied as neutrally as possible, merely to pay for the expenditures of the Federal Government, relegating the debate over the role the Federal Government is to assume to Federal expenditure policy?

Or should tax policy be used affirmatively to achieve certain other goals? There is no question that the levying of taxes, whatever be the philosophical theory behind it, just to pay for the expenditures of government or to deliberately produce other results has economic consequences, and the greater the need for governmental revenues to meet increasing government expenditures, the greater economic impact the imposition of taxes has.

However, I argue that it makes a great deal of difference, whether you write tax laws with the desire to minimize the economic impact of the tax take, or whether you intentionally seek to achieve specific social results.

Whatever human activity is taxed is, to some extent, burdened. So through tax laws government can burden certain endeavors and leave other endeavors unburdened which, if in competition with each other, can constitute a preference. The theory of the protective tariff is bottomed on this axiom.

The Federal sumptuary excise taxes on liquor and tobacco derive theoretical support from this axiom, albeit taxing sumptuaries has been found to be an excellent revenue producer and the main concern of the tax writer is to be certain that the tax rate isn't so high that the bootlegger has so large a margin of profit, vis-a-vis the legitimate taxpaying producer, that the tax rate gets beyond diminishing returns.

Tax take is an arithmetical formula stated as follows: Tax base times tax rate times a factor I call collectibility. As the tax rate goes up the base tends to diminish and so does the factor of collectibility. Accordingly, the tax rate can become so high that we actually collect less taxes, not more, from raising the rate. We would collect more by lowering the rate which would increase the base and, also, the factor of collectibility.

I am satisfied that the Federal corporate and individual income tax rates were raised in the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's to where they passed the point of diminishing returns. I think that even with the tax rate cuts of 1948, 1954, and 1964, our rates are still considerably beyond the point of diminishing returns.

However, there is an important factor which has kept the high Federal corporate and individual income tax rates from being as effectively beyond the point of diminishing returns as the rates themselves would indicate. This factor produces what tax collectors and economists know as the "effective" tax rate—around 25 percent—not 47 or 71 percent.

It is primarily this factor which enables the political practitioner to utilize the Federal tax structure to render major economic decisions, many of which he could not make through direct governmental expenditure policy.

This factor is the bundle of tax differentials, tax exemptions, varying tax rates, alternative methods of calculation, etc. which enable both individuals and corporations to avoid paying the published normal tax rates. The result is the phenomena of business judgments being made on the basis of tax considerations, rather than economics, to which I referred at the beginning of my paper.

Actually, we cannot have major tax reform, which is usually directed to these bundles of differentials, until we have lowered the tax rates. The reason lies in the fact that as long as the rates are high any alteration of the differentials, even one-half a percent, let alone 27½ percent, creates considerable economic consequence. It affects the wages, profits and savings of all manner of men and women and their industries. The pressures exerted on the Congress each time it seeks to alter differentials in the Tax Code, even in the slightest way, proves to any pragmatic observer of economics and political science the truth of this observation.

It is like a ship underway. If it is moving at a fast rate, say 25 knots, just the slightest touch to the rudder and the direction is altered, but if the rate of speed is a sluggish 2 or 3 knots, even the application of full rudder takes time to produce a change in direction. So with tax rates—reduce them and the economic consequences of the differentials in our tax laws are reduced. So some have argued that those who wish to manipulate the economy by means of the political process have deliberately kept the rates high. How deliberate all this may be

is a question, but that this is the result is beyond doubt.

Now, some have said to me, "How can you, with your various proposals for tax credits—to parents for part of the money they have spent for educating their children, to employers for an added amount beyond their total expenses for training and retraining manpower, to businesses for spending money in basic research, etc.—argue that you are a tax neutralist? Here you advocate using the tax power as a negative sort of a selective Federal excise tax, not to burden an economic endeavor to produce revenue, but to narrow the tax base by permitting an exemption to a particular economic endeavor."

This is a fair observation and deserves a full answer. I argue that my proposals follow the neutralist tax theory. Let me restate it. Government should collect its revenues with as little economic impact as possible. Tax collectors have always sought to tax that which was flourishing, rather than that which was languishing. Tax collectors have always sought to collect that which was easy to collect and avoid trying to collect that which, by its nature, was hard to collect. Tax collectors really have no morals about them. What seems to some observers to be in the nature of morality or equity really is only a matter of pragmatism. If a tax is equitably levied and equitably collected, the incidence of collectibility is enhanced. Conversely, when a tax is inequitably levied or collected, the incidence of collectibility diminishes rapidly. Accordingly, throughout history good tax collectors have always set aside areas of endeavors from the tax base which they do not tax.

I would also argue that it is sound tax policy, when the tax base is income, not capital, never to go after the goose, only after the golden eggs. I would also argue that it is sound tax policy not to tax an area of private expenditures which, if curtailed, would require direct governmental expenditure.

I also think the human being as an economic producer should be upgraded in our Federal tax laws to be at least the equivalent of a machine. A machine in our tax laws is set up on a capital account basis which allows for deductions for depreciation, expenditures for improvements, repair, maintenance, transportation, etc. Very few of these deductions are permitted to a human being or his employer. Part of the human capital account of particular importance today are the moneys invested in education and training.

Although the 16th amendment to the Constitution does not permit the Federal Government to tax capital, only income, the failure of our accounting profession to reflect properly the capitalization of a human being has permitted the Federal Government, in effect, to tax this capital. The tax credits I propose really are in areas of capital expenditures which, if properly treated, would qualify as plowback of capital which neither could nor should be taxed.

Almost all States historically have exempted from the levy of the bill collector a man's tools for making a living. So I have made a further proposal that the Federal Government should not only not tax seed corn—but should not tax a modicum of the seed corn, if planted to increase the plot beyond the original productive acre. If economic growth is part of standing still in a moving world, then a producer should be able to retain free from taxation enough seed corn to plant 2 acres where he had 1 before. If our tax base is income, and this is the essential tax base of our Federal Government, then such tax policy will produce a greater base and make way for a lower rate with yet a greater take.

The greater debate between the tax neutralists and the tax activists on fundamental Federal tax policy is much more sophisticated than that which I have been

discussing. It is true that the tax activists must have high tax rates to achieve their goals, by doling out the differentials, or preferentials, where they deem it wise economically and/or, I regret to say, politically. However, even more important to make their theories work, they argue they must have the Federal Government spend more money than it takes in, even beyond the increased revenues. It is a never ending chase. When they equate the governmental budget to the social budget, and that is what they are doing, of course the balance is never attained.

The theory is to use governmental fiscal policy, tax policy and debt policy, to increase aggregate purchasing power in the society which, in turn, will increase total production in the society to meet the ensuing demand. This, in turn, will require the producers to hire more manpower to meet these higher levels of production. This brings about the full cycle by increasing purchasing power within the society through the wages and salaries paid to the new workers. The trouble is the cycle is a spiral and ignores the basic structure on which the economic process is based.

To understand one of the basic fallacies of this theory, it is necessary to realize that the Federal debt is not simply a matter of deferred taxation, serious as the implication of that may be for later taxpayers, but that the Federal debt has become the base upon which our monetary policy is based through the impact of the Federal debt on the Federal Reserve System. To put it bluntly, if there were no Federal debt securities available, we would have to set up an entirely new system for creating and maintaining the value of money in our society.

It is the power to monetize the Federal debt that lies behind the basic theory of using Federal debt financing to increase purchasing power within the society. The Federal income tax rate cuts of 1964 were proposed by the new economists as a way to increase total purchasing power in the society by: (1) releasing \$12 billion in tax reduction to the private sector for business and consumer spending; (2) by continuing to expand, not curtail, Government expenditures; (3) by paying for decreased revenues and increased Government spending by increasing the amount of money extant in the society by having the Federal Reserve System, not business and the consumer, buy the additional Federal bonds which had to be offered.

The neutralist theory for the 1964 tax cut which they supported and which they had been urging for many years was that the income tax rates were impeding economic growth (eroding the tax base). If the rates were lowered, they argued, the base would expand and the tax take would be greater. However, to accomplish this without interim economic damage, the Federal expenditures had to be curtailed, because to finance both loss of revenues and increased expenditures by additional debt the Federal Reserve System would have to increase the money supply beyond the proven and anticipated real economic growth in the society. The increased purchasing power within the society would be unreal. It would be mainly the result of inflating the dollar. There would be no real economic expansion. A 3-percent rise in the implicit price deflator would take \$16 billion of real purchasing power out of the society in return for the \$12 billion increase in private purchasing power through the tax cut.

The important point that most people in America have lost sight of, including, I regret to say, many businessmen, is that the neutralist theory won out, not the theory of the new economics. The 1964 tax cut proved successful. The Republican motion to amend the 1964 tax bill stated simply that Federal expenditures had to be held to a \$97 billion level for fiscal 1964 and a \$98

billion level for fiscal 1965. President Johnson, after jawboning the Republicans for offering such a motion and successfully getting his leaders in Congress to defeat it, then went ahead, to his credit, and did them one better. Now everyone should look at the figures. They are the Government's figures. They are published and for anyone to see. Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were \$97.7 billion, \$0.7 billion more than the Republicans recommended. However, for fiscal 1965, the figures were \$96.5 billion, \$1.5 billion below the proposed figure.

For 2 months of the present fiscal year 1966, July and August 1965, the President was still manfully holding to the theory of expenditure restraint needed to make the 1965 excise tax cut beneficial. The annual expenditure average for those 2 months was \$97.3 billion.

However, in September 1965, the real Lyndon Johnson stood up, not just the "Vietnam hawk" but the "poverty king" as well. Expenditures zoomed to an annual rate of \$114 billion, at which rate they stayed for awhile, but are now on the increase. The 1967 budget message the Congress received late in January of this year raised the deficit for this fiscal year, 1966, from \$3.9 billion to \$11.1 billion, if we include the \$1.2 billion increase in taxes and the \$3 billion sale of capital assets the new estimate projects. The tragedy is that if the President had held to the \$98.7 billion rate of expenditures agreed upon as late as June 1965, the budget would be in balance this fiscal year. Inflation would be curbed. Our balance-of-payments problem would be met head on. Both our economic and our military power to meet international commitments would be enhanced, not weakened.

Instead we now, all of us, whether we like it or not, are going to have a chance to see how the new economics really works.

We are now engaged in deficit financing in a period of high economic upturn. We can get roast pork by burning down the barn—unemployment has gone below 4 percent—but I suggest that there are better ways of getting roast pork, less damaging ways, structurally.

Now my concluding remarks relate to what most of you probably expected me to talk about in more detail—some of the differentials in our tax laws that give preference to certain businesses or forms of doing business. For years I have been embarked upon a program of tax equalization—to make our tax laws neutral in respect to differing forms of doing business in competing areas of economic activity. I am anxious to bring this equalization about for two basic reasons. (1) I want to broaden the tax base. Anytime we can get an enterprise within the tax base we can lower the tax rates for everybody and still increase the tax take. (2) I also want to improve the incidence of collectibility which lowering the rate and broadening the base will accomplish, but so will improving the equity. A sense of equity is important in our Federal tax system, based as this system is upon the understanding and cooperation of our citizens. Many people chuckle when I say our tax collections are largely on a cooperative and voluntary basis. They have in mind the penalties, fiscal as well as criminal, which are imposed from time to time upon the backsliders.

However, I would argue that the overwhelming majority of persons and businesses file honest tax returns because they feel that others are doing the same and bearing their share. When we read about the offenders being caught and punished this gives us confidence that the system, by and large, is across the board and that we are not suckers paying while others get by. This is quite a different emotion from one of making an honest return only for fear of being caught. It is making an honest return because it is believed by and large everyone else is doing the same and the tax burden is being borne

equitably and generally throughout the society.

Now those who seek to have tax equality between forms of doing business should never forget that the real objective should be, for example, the single taxation of corporation, not the double taxation of cooperatives. However, in this day of a basically unreformed Federal income tax system and the need for revenue increasing, and the failure of those in power to understand that lowering the rate is the best way of increasing the base and so increasing the take, from a practical sense tax equity must come from increasing the single tax imposed on the co-op to more closely approximate the double tax imposed on the corporation.

Let me say, however, that there is equality in my judgment in providing for a tax differential for the cooperative which is limited to a marketing or purchasing process for its own membership and which is truly run by its members. The historical farm cooperative has a reason for a tax treatment different from a business dealing with the general consuming public at arm's length, as it were. I posed the following syllogism to a leader of one of the larger cooperatives a few years ago.

"Berle and Means pointed out in their classic study of corporations that when the stockholders reach a certain number and diffusion, in essence we have an organization controlled by management which has great powers to perpetuate itself in office and to name its successors. I think this is a true observation, and I see nothing sinister in this picture. (In many respects this is a healthy situation, provided all corporations don't reach this size.) The same situation applies, however, to the cooperative form of doing business. When a cooperative's shareholders or participants reach a certain number and diffusion, in essence we have a management run organization and the management has great powers to perpetuate itself and to name its successors. I see nothing sinister in this; in fact, this, too, is healthy. But I ask this question, what is economically or socially beneficial in the co-op form of doing business over the corporation form of business, once the two forms reach or begin to approximate the size described? I see no reason to give a differential tax treatment, one over the other. They are two management groups in competition with each other. Both enterprises should be in the tax base on an equal basis.

I see every reason for equalizing the Federal income tax laws to achieve this end. However, as I have said, I think it is important that a distinction between the closely owned farm cooperative be made, just as a distinction is made for the proprietorship and partnership form of doing business. Politically this is wise, because I find the big management controlled co-op hiding behind the concept of the small farm cooperative in fending off the day of tax equalization.

It is still great to be for the little fellow in America. I hope it always stays that way.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Members of the House in commemorating the birthday of our first President, George Washing-

ton. This annual observance, with Washington's Farewell Address read to us, is always one of the most inspiring events of the congressional session.

I am pleased to inform the House that the city of Hometown, Ill., has made a most significant gesture today while commemorating Washington's birthday. I submit for the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter which Mayor Francis E. Anderson directed to all the citizens of that fine community.

CITY OF HOMETOWN, ILL.,
February 1966.

Hometown will observe "Honor Our Armed Forces Day" on February 22, 1966. We are asking all residents to display the American flag either inside or outside depending on the weather. We believe that it is fitting that honor be accorded the men and women who are doing so much for us both at home and in foreign lands.

Draft cards have been burned and torn, derogatory signs have been carried and displayed; all incidents which would tend to discourage anyone who might be called upon to lay down his life for his country. We hope that "Honor Our Armed Forces Day" in Hometown will help in some manner to let these men and women know that we thank them for their devotion to country.

Your help in the promotion of the display of the American flag on this day is greatly appreciated.

FRANCIS E. ANDERSON,
Mayor.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, to represent a community with the fine leadership and true patriotic spirit that is being exhibited today in Hometown, Ill.

DE GAULLE-JOHNSON MEETING BADLY NEEDED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the enormous importance to the United States of French participation in the Atlantic alliance, I have urged President Johnson to arrange to visit Paris at the earliest possible date for the single purpose of meeting with President de Gaulle.

The visit is an overdue—and badly needed—gesture of friendship. The Presidents of France and the United States have had no real discussion for 5 eventful years. It might well be the historic first step down a long and mutually rewarding road of free world teamwork.

It is nearly a year since the House Republican committee on NATO first urged President Johnson to visit President de Gaulle. During that year the opposing views of France and the United States, in regard to the Atlantic alliance, have hardened to an alarming degree.

This week President de Gaulle once more gave fair warning that France will not put up with the present NATO command arrangement after 1969. In this he has been completely consistent. He issued much the same warning on Sep-

tember 9, 1965, when he said the French role in NATO is "subordination which is described as integration." He has repeatedly said France wants to remain allied with us but not on the basis of subordination.

If press reports are accurate, we have given De Gaulle an impossible choice, rebuffing his request for an alternate form of alliance. In effect, we have responded, "Accept the present arrangement or we will have nothing to do with you."

If we continue to respond to De Gaulle's challenge only by making plans contingent on French withdrawal, the inevitable conclusion is that the United States has written off France as an ally and considers the loss of small consequence.

Even if NATO finds a way to struggle along without France, the loss would be enormous. Former President Eisenhower recently described NATO without France as almost unthinkable. France occupies the great heartland of the Atlantic community. Through it flows the costly infrastructure of the alliance. The defense of Europe would be very difficult to organize without France.

The alienation of France would be a setback of incalculable proportions, not only in military terms but in economic, political, and spiritual.

Clearly the lack of French-American accord forms the major obstacle to getting on with the job of strengthening NATO, so it can deal with the many urgent problems which confront the Atlantic community.

The war in Vietnam, important though it is, must not be permitted to distract the President's attention from the mounting crisis in Europe.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports on H.R. 12169.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent talks in Honolulu were directed toward a primary emphasis upon a program of social revolution in the Vietnam countryside.

Social reform must be an integral part of our efforts in Vietnam because the elimination of Vietcong terrorism can be of no permanent usefulness unless the people are able to rebuild their lives and their economy.

The Los Angeles Times, on February 10, discussed the urgent priorities in-

involved in this social revolution. Their perceptive editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Whatever new military steps might have been secretly decided upon at the Honolulu conference of top American and South Vietnamese leaders, the public emphasis of the talks—and thus the public commitment—was focused upon an ambitious program of "social revolution" in the Vietnam countryside.

This is the "other war," the war of reform, which has the dual aim of bettering the lives of the people and of eradicating the accumulated grievances upon which the Vietcong have built so much of their success.

It is a war we have not been winning.

President Johnson made it clear in his Los Angeles remarks that he knows how hard are the tasks the United States and South Vietnamese Governments have set for themselves. Officials in the field whose job it is to carry out the planned programs of social, economic and political construction know even better the enormous obstacles to be overcome.

Even assuming total dedication on the part of South Vietnamese leaders and the ready availability of U.S. dollars, the going will be slow at best. The new programs, in fact, probably won't reach more than 10 percent of the village population by the end of the year. Nor will simply sending cadres into these villages of itself assure progress.

The first requisite, of course, is to clear areas of the Vietcong and to provide enough protection so that the Communists won't come back. Without security, peasants will have no incentive to cooperate and without cooperation there can be no reforms.

Next the Saigon government must find and adequately train the more than 40,000 teachers, health workers, technicians and administrators needed to start and carry out the social revolution. Without well-prepared and highly motivated personnel, reforms cannot even be talked about.

Recruiting these workers won't be easy.

Since the rebellion began, 20,000 of them have been murdered. They are Vietcong targets because they represent the government and because they carry the promise of improving life for the people, thereby undercutting the Vietcong appeal.

Those in this country and elsewhere who pretend to see the Vietcong as a movement against repression have yet to explain how killing nurses, doctors, teachers, and agricultural workers serves this end.

Finally, there is the task of overcoming deep-rooted attitudes which stand in the way of reform. Cynicism, corruption, suspicion, class prejudice, a reluctance to adopt new methods—all will be working against the new programs.

General Ky, his prestige bolstered by the Honolulu talks—the first time a Vietnamese Premier has met an American President—gives every public indication of being behind the reform program. It will take his full support, and much more besides, if there is to be any hope for success in this overdue but still vital revolution.

FLEET ADM. CHESTER NIMITZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served in the U.S. Armed Forces

in the Pacific during World War II share a particularly deep sense of grief over the passing of Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz.

More than any other single man, Admiral Nimitz was the architect of a winning strategy in the Pacific theater of operations.

President Roosevelt appointed him commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet shortly after the disastrous surprise attack against the United States at Pearl Harbor. When assigned this immense responsibility the large part of America's seapower had been destroyed. Japanese bombers had sunk 18 ships at Pearl Harbor, including 8 battleships.

The fleet, under Admiral Nimitz' leadership, recovered quickly and won a decisive victory over the Japanese forces in the Battle of the Coral Sea only 6 months later. The Battle of the Coral Sea and our subsequent victory in the Battle of Midway were the pivotal events in dooming the Japanese to their ultimate surrender.

At the time of surrender, the forces under the admiral's command included 6 divisions of U.S. marines, 6,256 ships, 14,847 combat aircraft, and the hundreds of thousands of men necessary to operate these weapons of war—the greatest armada ever assembled under one flag in history.

Admiral Nimitz served his country during peacetime in many capacities, including the chairmanship of President Truman's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, and 8 years as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California.

The admiral, as the men who served under him can testify, demonstrated that victory in combat is not only a matter of superior might but also the creation of a superior determination and morale. His achievements, in war and peace, exemplify courage and judgment as well as compassion and patriotism.

We shall sorely miss his inspiring presence as we face the grave challenges ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RIBICOFF FOR ALERTING CITIZENS ON THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT PERIL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, is a modern Paul Revere. No Member of the 89th Congress deserves more credit than he does for alerting our citizens to that deadly enemy of human life and happiness—the traffic accident—which lurks within every community and which daily claims the lives and wrecks the future hopes and happiness of men, women, and children.

His constant plea for congressional action reverberated in my mind when I read of the violent death of the Republican minority whip of the Maryland legis-

lature, the critical injury of a lovely young lady legislator and the injury of others last Thursday night in the city limits of Annapolis.

The fact that these legislators were mangled, although preliminary reports indicate that high speed was not involved, called to mind a statement made by Col. John Paul Stapp, the noted Air Force expert on the durability of the human body, that 42 percent or more of our traffic accident fatalities occur under survivable conditions.

If this is the case, then by appropriate preventive action we could save between 10,000 and 20,000 lives a year.

Last week Mr. Ralph Nader, author of the thought-provoking and industry-provoking book "Unsafe at Any Speed," testified before Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee. I consider this testimony to be of such importance that I am placing it in the body of the RECORD for the convenience and attention of every Member of Congress and the general public.

Mr. Nader is an able and an angry man. He has made a strong prima facie case for swift and effective action. I sincerely hope that full-dress public hearings will be scheduled in the near future, since the last such hearings were conducted 10 years ago by Alabama Congressman Kenneth Roberts. Surely the automobile industry will want an opportunity to answer the grave charges set forth by Mr. Nader. Perhaps more importantly, hearings on traffic safety should be expedited since more than 350,000 American citizens have perished since those hearings were concluded. It cannot be repeated too often that the traffic accident is the No. 1 killer of young people under the age of 25.

In my home county of De Kalb in Georgia all 12 traffic fatalities who died between January 1 and February 12 of this year were 28 years of age or younger. Nine were 21 years of age or younger. One was a 13-month-old baby. Seven of these fatalities occurred on the Interstate System in our county.

Fifteen Members of the Senate and 24 Members of this House have now sponsored the bill to create a National Traffic Safety Agency which would be charged by this Congress with responsibility to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and study of the total traffic accident phenomenon and by vigorous application of findings.

Mr. Nader has put the spotlight on one facet of the problem. Again I express appreciation for Senator RIBICOFF's unrelenting plea that this 89th Congress act now.

The text of Mr. Nader's testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH NADER BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The basic subject of inquiry before this subcommittee relates to the Federal role in motor vehicle safety. The public safety is one of the first and most fundamental functions of any government. Yet it is quite obvious that over the past five decades, there has been no more serious avoidance of governmental responsibility for the public safety than that which has persisted to the present day in the area of automobile transportation.

Year after year, with Medea-like intensity, the motor vehicle, through its traumatic and polluting impacts, performs as the greatest environmental hazard in this country—a hazard whose inceptions and consequences do not conform neatly to municipal, county, and State boundaries. And year after year, our scientific, technological, and organizational knowhow, and potential, to literally invent the future of motor vehicle safety, expand exponentially and thereby expose the shocking, shameful gap between what can be done and what is being done.

The enormity of this neglect by Government is not without some aggregate measure. The fatality toll on our streets and highways, since the first death by auto in 1899, is almost 1½ million; millions more have been permanently crippled and tens of millions have been injured. Last year, it is estimated that just under 50,000 people were killed and, too little noticed, over 4 million were injured. Deaths in 1965 amounted to approximately 1.8 million man-years of life lost. Between the ages of 5 and 30, extinction by motor vehicle is the American way of death; for the population as a whole, it is the fourth leading cause of death and the first man-made cause of death. These figures do not include the incalculable harm to individuals from automotive pollution.

Such are the statistics whose long familiarity is received with a conditioned boredom by most of the people who hear them. But they are bleeding statistics, notwithstanding their inability to project the rending torment of the tragedies to which they give numerical expression. The material costs, direct and indirect, of automobile collisions and injuries last year was about \$20 billion—a figure about equal to the retail sales of new automobiles in 1965. No other major consumer industry begins to approach this significant equivalence.

Against such a massive and costly assault on the safety of motor vehicle travel, the Federal Government has remained largely inert. It is instructive to ask and strive to reply to the following questions:

Why does the Federal Government not have the responsibility of setting safety standards for all highway motor vehicles as it does for all other transport vehicles—air, marine, and rail which all together account for 2 percent of the injuries and 8 percent of the fatalities in transportation?

Why has the Federal Government not spent more than \$5 million a year on highway safety research—driver, highway, and vehicle—when it has spent between \$40 and \$60 million a year on civilian aviation safety research—a form of transport which takes one-fiftieth of the lives and less than one five-hundredth of the injuries that are lost and incurred respectively on highways.

What kind of priorities and human values obtain when Congress can pass the Highway Beautification Act last year authorizing a sum of \$320 million to be appropriated over a 2-year period for landscaping, scenic enhancement, control of junkyards and outdoor advertising while the highway mayhem festers in neglect?

How can a national trauma which diverts some \$20 billion a year be approached, purely from a rational policy of conserving resources and reducing the level of nonvolitional expenditures, with such trivial resources and authority?

The answers to these questions invite detailed responses. In the interest of time, however, only brief commentary is possible.

First, the gigantic costs of automobile collisions have been integrated into our economy in such a way as not to motivate corrective or preventive action. The costs fall overwhelmingly, not on the producers of motor vehicles or the builders of highways, but on the users of motor vehicles who presently are in no position to require safer design and construction. This situation is

quite unlike air, marine, and rail transportation. Mishaps and casualties in these forms of transportation fall not only on the passengers but also on the operators and manufacturers as well. Consequently, there is an economic incentive—the continuing attractiveness of such modes of transport to travelers—for operators and manufacturers to take corrective action. The Federal Government also requires standards of safety to be met. It is important to note that the Government has been more alert in regulating the safety of a mode of transport if the hazards threaten the economic well-being of that system as they would for air, marine, and rail travel.

Death and injury by automobile neither threaten the auto industry nor the highway transport system generally. As far as motivating safer designs are concerned, automobile transport is by far the most impervious to casualties than any other type of transportation. It can absorb tremendous carnage on its roads without affecting the viability of automobile transportation. Under present conditions, there is little economic incentive for the auto maker to concern himself seriously with auto casualties and collisions—for the costs and penalties are not upon him. Actually, the more cars depreciate through collisions, the greater the demand for new and used cars. Only when there is a real threat of cost or other adverse feedback, as in the mass litigation over the 1960-63 Chevrolet Corvairs, does a manufacturer take notice and correct as General Motors did for the Corvair rear suspension system after those 4 tragic model years. But such feedbacks are very infrequent and, until the Corvair cases, never on a mass basis.

Neither do automobile collisions and injuries threaten the economy generally—at least there is no felt threat to the economy as there would be if, for example, a pest attack destroyed most of the cotton crop. For the costs of the highway epidemic are essentially economic demands feeding a vast highway accident service industry composed of medical, hospital, police, legal, insurance repair and administrative services. To put it squarely, death on the highway produces incomes and profits for hundreds of thousands of people and companies. It is a multibillion-dollar industry whose dynamics are hardly about to be in the direction of self-liquidation. The energies of lawyers and physicians (to choose the skills ideally most subject to professional standards of conduct) are so taken up in the care and handling of postaccident problems that they have had little time, even if they had the inclination, to exert effective and sustained efforts toward prevention of collisions and injuries. Law and medical students are offered a curriculum which does not even provide for the study of prevention in the context of their respective professional disciplines.

Thus, the economics of the highway accident industry and the operational health of the highway transport system do not breed self-correcting forces and the attention of government that obtains to a substantial degree in other forms of transportation. This condition has made the annual toll of 50,000 dead and millions injured the most expendable horror of our technological society. In America, life is cheapest on the highway. In macabre fact, as people lay dying and bleeding, they are contributing to the gross national product which takes but does not give to prevent further human losses.

Second, the Federal role has been held to the barest minimum through the efforts of the automobile industry whose over-riding objective is to preserve complete control over the design of automobiles and the manner in which they are merchandised. The continuance of private control over auto design is considered important by these companies as they continually narrow the quality of

their competition between themselves—a phenomenon well known to economists who study the behavior of highly concentrated or oligopolistic industries. However innovative the auto companies have been in cutting the costs of production their end product—the automobile—has been obsolete, particularly in terms of safety, for over 30 years. Unconventional insight into the “why” of this deplorable condition was offered by George Romney in 1958 when, as president of American Motors, he rendered his classic testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. Mr. Romney stated that the auto manufacturers by adopting a “common product philosophy” have ended “their basic product competition.” “Why should they promote customer interest,” Mr. Romney noted, “in new product engineering possibilities that might eventually obsolete their existing production facilities?”

Instead, the competition between the auto companies centers around exaggerated touting of trivial differences garnished by throbbing adjectives and beckoning young women, large promotional expenditures, the size and strength of dealer systems and price adjustments at the dealer level. When it comes to the product itself—the automakers are competing more and more about less and less. “Protective imitation” by Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors becomes ever more insistent as the dominant product and price leader—General Motors with over half the market—reflects the limits of permissible variation. Notice, for example, the uniformity of the useless, recessed bumper design which exposes fenders, lights, etc., to damage and costly repair in slight contacts with other vehicles or structures. The irreverent question was never truer—“Did you see the latest Ford, made by Chrysler, down at the Chevrolet dealer?”

By concentrating so heavily on auto style, the companies achieve the flexibility of stimulating and then exploiting a wide array of emotional involvements by the buying public in their new automobiles. Producers of consumer products generally seek to form many identities between their products and potential consumers. With increasing precision, manufacturers of such goods have learned that by selling an aura, a package or a style of a product, the buyer's attention to the quality of the product is diminished. For automobiles, this choice of sales strategy leads to definable advantages for a highly concentrated industry with enormous barriers to entry by new domestic firms. For one thing, it leads to the progressive reduction of consumer sovereignty because its inherent thrust is to expand and exploit consumer ignorance of the basic functional qualities of the vehicles and focus attention on images and trivial distinctions. For another, it is a highly convenient deflator of any pressures for technological innovation if the market system was operating under the strains of a competition that offered the consumer genuine choices. In terms of product competition, the automobile industry is closer to closed enterprise than it is to free enterprise. Because their market structure, conduct and performance have subverted the basic requisites of a free market system, we have the spectacle of a gigantic industry wallowing in a profitable technological stagnation and relying on superficial cosmetic changes and the inexorable coming of a new year every 12 calendar months to peddle the “all new, unsurpassed” car model. How tragic are the results and how costly the impact on purchasers of America's largest consumer durable. The car buyer pays over \$700 (according to a study by MIT, Harvard and University of Chicago economists) when he buys a new car for the cost of the annual model change which is mostly stylistic in content. Consider how much safer today's automobile would be if over the past two decades the

car buyer received annually a substantial safety advance—both in the operational and crashworthy aspects of his automobile—for that \$700 payment.

Instead, cars are being built which, standing still, can kill adult and child pedestrians who fall or are inadvertently pushed into their sharp points and edges. And passengers can die in collisions at speeds as low as 5 m.p.h. Is it any wonder that, at present rates, at least 1 out of every 2 living Americans will either be killed or injured (disabled beyond the day of injury) in an automobile collision? For those with a full life span of 70 years ahead of them, the probabilities are considerably higher. Yet the orgy of expenditure for style which is charged to the consumer every year as entirely standard equipment continues unabated. A style change for the rear end of a Mustang, for example, will cost the manufacturer close to \$50 million.

There are those rare instances when the impressive containment of public self-criticism by auto executives exhausts itself temporarily. Such an instance occurred in January 1964 when Donald Frey, a perceptive vice president of Ford Motor Co., told a gathering of automotive engineers: “I believe that the amount of product innovation successfully introduced into the automobile is smaller today than in previous times and is still falling. The automatic transmission was the last major innovation of the industry.” (The automatic transmission, you may recall, was first adopted on a mass-production basis in 1938-39). Henry Ford II seemed troubled by this same lack of innovation when he told the same audience: “When you think of the enormous progress of science over the last two generations, it's astonishing to realize that there is very little about the basic principles of today's automobiles that would seem strange and unfamiliar to the pioneers of our industry * * *. What we need even more than the refinement of old ideas is the ability to develop new ideas and put them to work.” The smog-ridden people of Los Angeles for many years have been troubled by the same thought as they struggled against an intransigent, unified industry that produced millions of little pollution factories on wheels and refused to apply the necessary remedial engineering to clean them up. Apparently, diagnosis is far from treatment. The 1966 Ford advertisements boast of “engineering magic.” The expectant reader, rushing to read on, learns that this “magic” is composed of an optional stereo-sonic tape system and a station wagon tailgate that swings open for people and pulls down for cargo. With such “magic” our space endeavors would have gotten us no further to the moon than Mount Everest.

The annual model change ritual is not meaningful innovation for the public safety and welfare; its purpose is to “stir the animal” in the car buyer. It is aimed not at the reason of men but at their ids and hypogastria. Can there be anything less than a fundamental contempt for the consumer in the following advertisements:

A closeup picture of the front of the Buick Skylark over the title “Son of gun.” The copy asks the reader: “Ever prodded a throttle with 445 pound-feet of torque coiled tightly at the end of it? Do that with one of these and you can start billing yourself as the human cannonball.”

Teenagers can turn on the radio and hear an ad that begins with a deep growl. Is it a cue for Tarzan of the apes? An announcement of a circus coming to town? By no means. It is the Pontiac widetrack tiger and the announcer urges the listener to come on down and ride the tiger at tiger country (formerly known as your Pontiac dealer).

A 1966 Buick Riviera ad tries this sensual effect: “If there are two things the romantic Italians love, one of them is automobiles. Dashing, dramatic automobiles. Now, some

people think Italy has a monopoly on the red-blooded cars that make hearts beat faster and the adrenalin flow. But those people have another think coming. The tuned car is here. Con Brio."

Other ads urge the potential driver to "drive it like you hate it," or, after spelling out the 400-plus horsepower, advising that "it's cheaper than psychiatry."

While the recent spate of Ford safety ads, in response to a growing public outrage over unsafe design, urge the reader to "cultivate a safety state of mind . . . thinking safety" (and GM is doing the same), Ford continues to name its cars with such aggressive and ferocious titles as Comet, Meteor, Thunderbird, Cobra, Mustang (Mustang means "a wild, unbreakable horse") and Marauder (which means literally "one who pillages and lays waste the countryside"). There are also the Plymouth Fury and Barracuda, the Oldsmobile Cutlass and the Buick Wildcat—to name a few. And coming soon to join the menagerie on the highways are the Mercury Cougar and the Chevrolet Panther.

As Prof. Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois Law School asked recently in a letter to the New York Times, detailing some of these calculated appeals to power, speed, and other aggressive instincts: "Shall the wolves be shepherds?"

The answer to this question must be "No." It must be "No" for two independently sufficient reasons.

First, a genuine democracy has to provide for the participation of the public in decisions relating to technology whose use is so fraught with tragedy to millions of people. There is an old Roman adage which says: "Whatever touches all should be decided by all?" The automobile touches us all in the most ultimate ways. The safety the motorist gets when he buys his car should not be determined solely by manufacturers—especially a tightly knit few—whose interests are necessarily one of profit-parochialism. A democratic polity should not permit an industry to unilaterally decide how many years it wishes to hold back the installation of superior braking systems, safer tires and fuel tanks that do not rupture and incinerate passengers in otherwise survivable accidents, suppress safer instrument panels and steering assemblies and seat structures and frame strengths, or to engage in a stylistic orgy of vehicle-induced glare, chrome eyebrow bumpers and pedestrian impalers—to take only a few examples of many. Instead the amount of safety should be determined by a fuller dialog and clash of values of the entire democratic community. This is hardly a new idea. Our country has applied such a philosophy long ago to other areas of safety—safety codes for buildings and factories, food and drug regulations, safety standards for aircraft, ships, and trains, safety examinations for professional skills. However inadequate such rules and their administration are, they do represent progress when contrasted with the alternatives. They also represent society's decision that democratic participation is to extend to hazardous economic activities or products.

In the area of automobile design, this public participation to raise continuously the operational and crashworthy safety of motor vehicles does not exist. The automobile has been the sacred cow. Because of the attenuated competition of a concentrated industry, product choices are being made, in effect, for the consumer by the manufacturers to the extent that they have muted the market signals which consumers would ideally have in exercising their choice or expressing their wishes. More significant, the public has not been able to make its collective judgments felt through the governmental process. This is the case because both the automobile and its maker are in the uniquely immune position of being outside of the law, in four ways.

1. The automobile does not have to adhere to any meaningful public safety standards for crashworthiness and operational safety. Existing State standards are limited to headlamps and a small number of other equipment; they are grossly inadequate even in the areas they purport to cover and enforcement is virtually nonexistent. All States, it is believed, now require windshields along with windshield wipers.

2. There is no public inspection to insure that automobiles are built even to conform with the manufacturers' own quality control standards. Indeed, there is no requirement that there be a public filing of the numerous confidential bulletins and service letters or other communications between manufacturers and dealers concerning defects and deficiencies discovered in new car runs after thousands of these cars have already been sold. The unknowing driver who survives a collision because of such defects is required to assume any legal responsibility—not the manufacturer.

3. The role of automobiles in causing accidents and injuries goes virtually uninvestigated while the police are duty bound to enforce laws written almost exclusively in terms of driver fault. Clearly, there are differences between accident causes and injury causes—the latter causes are overwhelmingly related to the auto's design. Yet note the accident report form in State after State and see how there are no categories for the cause of injury and only categories for driver fault as the cause of accident—vehicle failure is routinely considered owner or driver neglect.

4. There are not statutory criminal penalties for manufacturing a defective automobile dangerous to life. An automaker is not within the scope of such laws. But drivers are exposed to criminal fines and imprisonment—manslaughter charges—for gross negligence leading to one or more deaths. Driver behavior is within the rule of law; vehicle design and manufacturing behavior is outside the rule of law. Could corporate and managerial immunity from public accountability be more complete?

Being outside the law has all the predictable consequences of public anarchy. I shall not dwell here on a detailed enumeration of the hazardous features and safety obsolescence of contemporary automobiles. They have been well enumerated, together with a realistic vision of safety innovations that can come with an automobile if there was the care, in the first feasibility study of the New York State safety car program. Other research reports and data analyses financed through Federal grants and contracts similarly inform. But I do want to allude to the industry practices that are adverse to the public's safety interest and that comprise the second reason for governmental action—

1. The industry has actively cultivated a consumer ignorance about safety by promoting a concept of an automobile that stresses style, ride, and performance. While eager to tell the potential customer about the rated horsepower, acceleration capability, and kinds of interior decor, the automaker will not tell him, even if he demands it, such important facts about the safety of the cars as: brake stopping ability, tire skid and blow-out resistance, roof collapse strength, door latch and door hinge strength, the dash panel's and windshield's cushioning ability, the amount of rearward displacement of the steering wheel and shaft under a forward crash into a fixed barrier, the side and roof crash resistance of the vehicle and the seat anchorage strength. These technical values can all be given in quite precise terms against clearly expressed criteria. Since the automakers boast about their instrumented crash testing, they must have the answers. But they will fight to the end to deny their publication for the motoring public—notwithstanding the fact that nearly half of all

cars will be involved, sometime in their use, in an injury-producing collision.

Lamentably, this industry's secrecy places severe restraints on company researchers and ruptures the canons of scientific communication with professional colleagues outside the industry. Again and again, I have listened to independent scientists and engineers at universities and elsewhere outside the industry complain at the near impossibility of communicating with industry employees on what is presumably a common dedication to save lives. The corporate plea of proprietary data is an excuse, not a reason. The reason is that the carmakers want no public knowledge of their safety work or neglect thereof. Such knowledge might raise expectations or ignite indignations for greater safety.

2. The automakers are spending a pittance on safety research and development for basic innovation. In the area of vehicle aerodynamics and handling analysis—a subject of growing urgency as vehicle speeds increase—there is deep neglect and shocking theoretical ignorance. Of more immediate interest is the flimsy allocation of human and financial resources to crashworthiness or second collision research. It is doubtful whether General Motors, a company which grossed \$20.7 billion in 1965 (greater than the entire gross national product of Brazil and greater than the Government of France's revenue that year) devoted \$1 million for second collision research in 1965—or two-hundredths of 1 percent of its gross receipts.

3. The auto industry is utterly devoid of any measure of corporate humility so necessary for internal regeneration. Never once in response to public questioning has any company representative admitted the dangerous connection between auto exhaust and driver safety. Yet experts such as Harvard's Ross McFarland and Cal Tech's Arlie Haagen-Smit have warned about the fatigue and nausea-inducing impact of carbon monoxide levels not infrequent in heavy urban or suburban freeway traffic. In addition, reduced visibility from automotive pollution has led to temporary closing down of turnpikes. Those who still prefer the voluntary approach should remember the action by Ford Motor Co. which took off on many of its models the blowby devices that curtailed crankcase emissions in 1964 after it had agreed to put them on earlier in order to avoid legislation. It took these devices off without notifying car buyers or the Government, and did not reinstall them until notified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The hardening of the corporate arteries even extends to an adamant refusal to recognize the dangers of pointed ornaments, dagger fins, and sharp edges prevalent on the front and backs of automobiles to many of the nearly 500,000 pedestrians struck each year by motor vehicles. Still the juggernaut plunges ahead. Consider the description of the 1966 "Toronado—a brandnew musclecar—by Hubert Lockett, executive editor of Popular Science: "Functionally, the front bumper design is insane. It shares this monstrous affront to commonsense with several Detroit cars this year. A massive wedge-like projection on the sides would be murderous to a hapless pedestrian unfortunate enough to step in its path. And it could easily hang up on a guardrail post, turning an otherwise minor mishap into a disaster." A brandnew car with old line negligence.

4. By its repeated behavior, the auto industry has shown that public pressure is the only stimulus to which it grudgingly and slowly responds. Auto companies opposed seat belts for years, ridiculing their proponents, then finally offered them as optional extra cost equipment and in January 1964, under pressure of enacted legislation, decided to make them standard equipment. The industry rigged odometers—an inher-

ently deceptive practice which fleeced and misinformed motorists about rental fees, warranties, trade-in wear and gas mileage—until the National Bureau of Standards proved an average overregistration in mileage by some 3.5 percent. Caught in the act, the industry relented to new standards but only after making sure they were still inadequate. The point is that there is never any punishment or deterrent to such behavior, as there would be for individuals. The only question for the industry is when will it be exposed and chided, not how it will have to face up to the law—which does not exist. And just yesterday the auto companies announced that a collapsible steering column and a dual braking system will be available for the 1967 models—thanks to the pressure by public officials which took off the shelf designs that were there for years. Such concessions have been wrung from the industry only after thousands of deaths and millions of injuries have occurred. The companies have not changed their phony arguments about a 3-year leadtime, about exorbitant cost, about the product “looking like a tank” and other obstacle courses which now can only, at best, be overcome in piecemeal and slow fashion. The manufacturers are always telling us what they cannot do in vague unsupported terms, never what they can do. Even when they announce the installation of collapsible steering columns for next year's models, they do not give us the performance values of the design. These are the same companies who offered padded dashboards for extra cost until 1965 on most models even though they offered little safety advantage and on some models were a greater hazard than unpadded dashboards.

5. In recent months, the auto companies, moving as a coalition through their trade body, the Automobile Manufacturers Association and their technical servant, the Society of Automotive Engineers, are forging new institutions and new industrywide unanimities to stall or fight off the increasingly focused expressed of the motorist's need for greater vehicle safety. One such institution heavily promoted and influenced by the industry and its tax-exempt agent, the Automotive Safety Foundation, is the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission—presently adhered to by a majority of States on the urging of State motor vehicle administrators. The VESC is a wholly unnecessary interlayer between the States and the Federal Government that torpedoed the very meaning of federalism and distorts out of all proportion the utility of regional State compacts. After all, the very purpose of a federal government is to assume responsibility for those public issues which significantly and continuously are interstate in character. The VESC is a device to block Federal action and strip the States of independent legislative initiatives. This latter objective was driven home to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Traffic Safety in 1964 when the Automobile Manufacturers Association sent the committee chairman, Senator Edward J. Speno, a letter imperiously recommending that all the vehicle safety bills before the Committee be referred to the VESC.

State support for the VESC has come primarily from State motor vehicle departments who have long been accustomed to working with the AMA and who have shared its preference for keeping vehicle safety issues on an administrative level of decisionmaking. The abundantly generous hosting of parties and dinners by the auto industry at annual meetings of the American Association of Motor Vehicles Administrators—a private, not public organization incidentally—helps restore old friendships. It is no coincidence that the AAMVA is presently housing the VESC in its offices in Washington and that the Automotive Safety Foundation has

granted funds to the AAMA for VESC promotion.

The united industry front can also be seen in the manner in which the General Services Administration is being handled—a development which might be of considerable interest to this subcommittee. GSA trundles along conceding prearranged industry positions, ignoring outside advice by acknowledged specialists such as the FAA's John Swearingen and Dr. Merrill Allen of Indiana University, in a headlong thrust toward making a mockery out of the legislative intent of the Roberts bill, Public Law 88-515. The purpose of this law was to have an active safety-oriented Federal procurement of passenger vehicles serve as a meaningful pacesetter instead of a contorted instrument to promote industry options, to facilitate industry price increases and to ratify existing industry safety levels.

Against such a background and foreground of industry practice and policy, the Federal Government must take a decisive role in highway safety. This does not mean that the Federal Government should preempt the field entirely from the States. It does mean that the various endeavors undertaken by public authorities be analyzed to determine which level of Government is best equipped to have the particular responsibility. No longer can we afford to repeat the general invocation—so beloved by the traffic safety establishment—that “the primary responsibility for traffic safety is vested in the States.” In questioning the fervent advocates of this article of faith, I have never been able to derive any revealed justification other than it was so in the days of William Howard Taft. But these advocates have their undisclosed reasons that all lead to protecting the status quo dedicated to the proposition that traffic safety is chiefly driver behavior and may the special interests be protected forever after. For when the status quo is perturbed by State actions, as is occurring in New York, where the automobile is coming in for some attention, these advocates press hard for the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission and traditional AMA wisdom as the founts for all States to look to for inspiration and guidance. In refusing the repeated requests to appear at an executive hearing in Iowa sent them by Attorney General Lawrence F. Scallise, the four auto companies complained of the burden it would be to appear at such State hearings and informed him that the AMA representative would be there only. The AMA representative, Karl Richards, then stood up and declined to answer any technical questions or any questions dealing with corporate policy or specific cars. Iowa's right to know about the safety of the products that its people purchase and drive by the hundreds of thousands every year was squelched by an industry that just was bigger than that State.

I view the task of the Federal Government as one of implementing a public policy for automobile safety that brings into operation the scientific and engineering talents and resources of the Nation. It is encouraging to note that, at long last, the thinking and research done by a tiny group of bright, dedicated civil servants in the Bureau of Public Roads' Office of Research and Development is beginning to find verbal receptiveness among the Department of Commerce's top policymakers.

Speaking before the Highway Research Board on January 18, 1966, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Allan S. Boyd, said: “Probably the most promising approach to significant, tangible improvements in highway safety in the immediate future lies in the application of modern technology * * *. Its application, in essence, means that we must understand the capabilities and limitations of the driver and then design improvements in the vehicle-highway system to make his driving more reliable and

more effective. It means we can prevent accidents or mitigate their consequences by additions or modifications to the vehicle and the roadway.”

Last November, Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, was quite emphatic in drawing upon the findings of the Bureau of Public Roads:

“So the Interstate System is getting results. And it is getting them because highway engineers relied on facts and rejected the emotional and widely held, but fallacious, belief that almost all accidents are somehow caused by driver error or failure, through carelessness or irresponsibility.

“This belief stems naturally enough from our system of accident reporting, which tends to be in terms of traffic violations, and from our concept of legal liability, and it has been reinforced by well-publicized safe driving campaigns. It leads, of course, to the assumption that, if almost all accidents are caused by driver error, the way to eliminate them is to make all drivers drive better.

“And since most motorists consider themselves good drivers, it leads further to the assumption that most accidents are caused by a small group of dangerous, accident-prone drivers. Therefore, if we could get them off the road we would not have accidents.

“Unfortunately, these assumptions are not supported by the facts. An analysis by the Bureau of Public Roads just last summer showed that almost an entirely different group of drivers is involved in accidents each year, and removing the repeaters—those who have two or more accidents in any one year—would have virtually no effect on the following year's accidents. The facts are that the great bulk of accidents involve average, normally responsible drivers. No one is immune. It is the accumulation of rare accidents, occurring to all too many generally good drivers, that principally account for our annual traffic toll.

“The fact is that most drivers, most of the time, are driving near the limits of their ability—considering the complexity of the traffic situation and of the driving task. * * * In our pursuit of safety the emphasis on remedial engineering rather than reprimand represents an important breakthrough.”

The next step from such an understanding would seem to be to construct a scale of policy priorities aimed at reducing automobile casualties. Two operating principles of a profoundly proven nature in many fields of man-machine interaction are crucial here: (1) Safety measures that do not rely on or require people's voluntary and repeated cooperation are more effective and more reliable than those that do. (2) The sequence of events that leads to an accident-injury can be broken by engineering measures even before there is a complete understanding of the causal chain. Thus, for example, improved braking systems that do not fade or lock, safer tires, safer handling characteristics, and the elimination of vehicle-induced glare and carbon monoxide reduce the strains on the driving task and the risk of accidents. And most important, a crash-resistant automobile which protects the occupants from collision forces can make accidents safer, if not altogether safe. Indeed, since present technology is capable of producing cars economically, conveniently and attractively to protect occupants without significant injury in collisions up to and over 50 m.p.h. (depending on the nature of the collision), and since at least three-fourths of all deaths and serious injuries occur at impact speeds under 50 m.p.h., the course of action for rational men to pursue is to have such automobiles built.

The plain fact is that it is faster, cheaper, and more enduring to build operationally safe and crashworthy automobiles that will prevent death and injury than to build a policy around the impossible goal of having

drivers behave perfectly at all times under all conditions in the operation of a basically unsafe vehicle and under often treacherous highway conditions. We can try ad infinitum to get all 95 million drivers to learn, and instantly act on this learning, that panic brake applications in certain emergency situations, particularly on wet surfaces, are likely to lock the brakes with consequent loss of control of the vehicle. Or we can simply apply what is presently known and build automobiles with antilocking braking systems.

The lessons are as comparable in automobile design for injury prevention as they are for accident prevention. A crashworthy automobile is the last clear chance to prevent bloodshed; it is that final net that catches all the contributing factors in the collision sequence and cuts the sequence so that casualties are prevented or minimized. In this strategic placement, a crashworthy vehicle is highly efficient in that it can take all the infinite and far more intractable variables expressed through the behavior of drivers interacting with highways and vehicles and make the output fail-safe. By way of illustration, a safe dash panel, steering assembly and seat structure are constant factors ready to avert disaster; they do not depend on how they feel, on how they are educated or exhorted or admonished or fined to do their work. They do their work because they are there, in shape all the time. Just 4 years of automobile production will comprise half of all mileage traveled. A mass production industry can turn out such vehicles on the command of a tiny handful of men. Automating safety in automobiles consequently has great administrative as well as time advantages.

Yet instead of a rigorous analysis of priorities so as to get the fastest and most efficient safety output from given inputs, we hear the incantations about "balanced traffic safety programs" or that it is really all "the nut behind the wheel." The best that can be said about such thinking is that it is primitive. A civilized society should want to protect even the nut behind the wheel from paying the ultimate penalty for a moment's carelessness, not to mention protecting the innocent people who get in his way. These and other similar handy mottoes are part of a self-serving ideology—there is no better word for it—of traffic safety strongly developed and perpetuated by the automobile industry in order to divert the public's gaze from the role of vehicle design. Consider the potent force of the second collision idea once it was sprung loose, not from industry sources, but from the projects supported by the Federal Government which wrapped data and photographs around this idea to nurture it on its way to the political and legislative policymaking process.

Here we arrive at the nub of the problem in traffic safety. The barriers to progress and innovation are not knowledge gaps but the overabundance of special interests which the scientists euphemistically call "nontechnical obstacles" to change. These special interests tragically have included the very groups which could have been the classic countervailing and disciplining powers on the auto industry—namely, the casualty insurance industry and the American Automobile Association. But the accommodations of other interests with the auto industry have sacrificed the vehicle design safety interest.

The latest performance of the direct and indirect power of the automobile and allied interests to divert, deter, and diminish the more effective measures for cutting the highway toll will become apparent very shortly when the administration sends its proposed Highway Traffic Safety Act of 1966 to the Congress. Reliable public indications point to a request for substantially more funds for research which is desirable. But the administration's proposal will not solve the juris-

ditional and administrative bottlenecks within the executive branch that have impeded action, will not request authority for mandatory automobile safety standards, will not provide for the construction of prototype safety cars, but will ask for sizable sums of money for existing and least effectively conceived programs at the State level—all to be primarily guided for the consumer's benefit by the Department of Commerce. (If this latter arrangement is a paradox, it is an institutionalized one.) Another no-law law for the consumer's protection will be put before Congress and the National Safety Council, the Automotive Safety Foundation, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, and the President's Committee for Traffic Safety—those misnomers of the traffic safety establishment—will breathe a sigh of relief.

Of course, my predictions could be wrong. I would be delighted if they were.

Until the suffocating hand of the so-called national traffic safety organizations and their omnipresent automotive patron is lifted once and for all by an aroused citizenry and government, the critical priorities will not be translated into action. A good place to begin anew is with the President's Committee for Traffic Safety. This Committee is an executive agency employing civil servants over whom stand Mr. William Foulis, the Executive Director, and Dr. Richard Tossell, his assistant. These two men are privately paid by the automobile and insurance industries. The President's Committee really functions only through the administrative committee (of the Advisory Council to the President's Committee) which sets the policy. The President's Committee is composed of 16 private citizens and its Chairman, William Randolph Hearst, Jr. As a Government agency controlled outright by private automobile interest groups, the President's Committee occupies a place unique in the history of American government. Never before have private business groups established themselves within Government in order to exploit the prestige of the President and his Office. Officials in the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies have repeatedly urged that this anomalous condition be terminated, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., notwithstanding. It can only be assumed that once the President finds time to turn his attention to this problem, it will be resolved in the only appropriate manner.

Last week, President Johnson stated to the American Trial Lawyers Association that the "gravest problem before this Nation—next to the war in Vietnam—is the death and destruction, the shocking and senseless carnage, that strikes daily on our highways and that takes the highest and more terrible toll each year." Implicit in this statement would seem to be an increased awareness of the necessity for Federal leadership. In the most important area—that of obtaining safer automobile design and construction, there is a need for five Federal functions:

1. Standards and inspection function: The establishment of carefully administered dynamic standards for automobile safety performance to get faster application of known technology and override the barriers to innovation now rampant in the huge bureaucratic structures known as the American automobile companies. To have meaning, standards require an attendant form of inspection or crashworthiness certificate to make sure the standards are met. Both criminal penalties and injunctive powers should be provided in any legislation.

2. Research and development function: Behind the chrome curtain there is too little safety research and many an excuse between research and use. A Federal facility for research into automobile design safety will serve to advance sharply the state of knowl-

edge and will also encourage and support independent centers of such work around the country and break the near monopoly of automotive engineering presently held by the automobile industry. Such a facility will be a major contributor to the constant upgrading of Federal performance standards and would include the design, construction and testing of prototype vehicles, as envisaged by S. 2162 introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON and presently before this subcommittee.

3. Federal support function: Financial and technical assistance to the States for the establishment of proficient accident-injury investigative teams to collect the data for future preventive policies and to provide the facts for the just adjudication of legal responsibility instead of the automatic bias of blaming the driver in lieu of an investigation. Elemental notions of due process of law require such a program. Support should also be given for vehicle inspection of a scope well beyond the nominal procedures employed today and the inspection standards written by the auto industry. Administrative safeguards against corruption and other abuses of State inspection programs must be carefully devised.

Data and other experience from these accident-injury investigations and inspections should be aggregated and processed with the objective of determining patterns of make and model failure due to defective design or poor quality control. All bulletins and other communications between the manufacturer and dealer about such defects should be publicly filed with the appropriate State authority together with a copy of the communication to the car buyer which should be required under prescribed forms.

The Federal Government must establish once and for all, as it has for aviation safety, the principle and practice of recalling defective makes and models of automobiles for correction by the manufacturer at its dealer or other suitable location. The 1960-63 Corvairs with their extraordinary tendency for rear-end breakaway behavior leading to uncontrollability and rollover are prime candidates for such recalls. There are at least 750,000 Corvairs remaining out of these 4 years of production. By merely adding rebound straps, replacing the rear springs, and installing an antiroll bar in the front suspension—at a total material and labor cost to Chevrolet not exceeding \$15 per car, the risk of many deaths and injuries can be substantially reduced. Warnings to owners, through advisories and printed decals in a prominent location on the vehicle, about the critical importance of the proper tire inflation pressures front and rear should be included.

4. Statistical and data processing function: The Nation can no longer rely on a private organization—the National Safety Council—for its traffic accident-injury statistics. In no other area of mortality and morbidity statistics has the Government relied on a private organization. With the immense potential offered by the computer for fast, complex, and meaningful data processing and with the forthcoming implementation of the Baldwin amendment pressing the States for more explicit, more uniform, and more adequate highway safety standards, it is all the more incumbent upon the Federal Government to establish a complete statistical facility.

The entire information and data output of projects financed by the Federal Government at universities or other institutions should be obtained by the Government. The decade long situation at the Cornell Automotive Crash Injury Research (Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory) whereby data relating to specific accident cases are funneled exclusively to the manufacturers and denied all public agencies, even though these data are obtained chiefly through Government funding and

support, is a disgrace too long tolerated and overdue for congressional investigation.

5. Educative and alert function: This should involve a governmental contribution to the improved working of the marketplace. First, the manufacturers should be required to file annual reports detailing, with supporting technical data, the operational safety and crashworthy improvements in their automobiles and disclosing any deteriorations. This information should be then translated into readily understandable consumer publications distributed by GPO to better inform the car buyer about the choices available to him and generally to improve his critical capacity. In addition, the antitrust laws should be rigorously enforced to dissolve any collusive or concerted activity on an industrywide basis or between various manufacturers to restrain the development and/or marketing of safety features. An analysis of the present scope of antitrust law may well lead to recommendations for strengthening them to cover subtler, though just as harmful, anticompetitive behavior.

If these and other Federal functions in highway safety are to be administered fairly and efficiently, a thorough reorganization of the present dispersal of responsibility into one or possible two administrative units is necessary. With the President's recommendation last month for a Department of Transportation, it is quite clear that the administration is engaged in just such an endeavor as part of an overall reorganization of the Government machinery for transportation.

All the above points to meticulous care in drafting the law to anticipate the many problems that would otherwise arise and provide the necessary safeguards against easy administrative rigidity, erosion, or capitulation to the regulatees. This is a demanding legislative task—one that calls for an ambitious exercise of the legislative hearing function to gather together the facts and judgments that will increase the wisdom of final policy decisions. This subcommittee has compiled two volumes of considerable value, but the bulk of the iceberg remains beneath the ocean. Many more volumes need to be assembled to explore the workings of government, industry, and to hear from other groups and specialists connected with motor vehicle safety in various ways. Taken together they will illuminate the pitfalls and tragedies of the past which are to be avoided, extend the awareness of the problems and remedies throughout the land, and construct a scenario of the future toward which we all should strive.

THE JOB CORPS IS MAKING PROGRESS IN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a really excellent article by Howard Persinger, staff writer for the Aliquippa Steelworker, which appeared in the January edition of that publication. The article is entitled "Opportunities Unlimited," and it describes the tremendous contribution to America's future being made by the Camp Parks Job Corps Training Center in Pleasanton, Calif.,

which is operated for the Office of Economic Opportunity by Litton Industries, Inc., educational systems division.

The article points out that 2,000 disadvantaged young men from all over the Nation are currently receiving basic and citizenship education and widely varying job training in such important fields as office machine repair, automotive work, radio and electronics, welding, building maintenance, and culinary arts. In addition, the corpsmen have access—for the first time—to arts and crafts, and publish their own newspaper. As the article puts it, Camp Parks has brought to the corpsmen "a rebirth of hope where there was despair, and light where there was darkness."

Mr. Speaker, we must not ignore such compelling evidence that the Job Corps is making tremendous progress in the war against poverty. I would like to have Mr. Persinger's article, together with a related Steelworker editorial entitled "Last Chance To Be Somebody" inserted at this point in the RECORD:

OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED

(By Howard Persinger, staff writer)

"Opportunities unlimited." Within these two words is contained a world of meaning to approximately 2,000 boys. These boys are now receiving training in basic education, citizenship, and in a vocation at the Camp Parks Job Corps Center, which is located at Pleasanton, Calif. The two words symbolize a rebirth of hope where there was despair, and light where there was darkness.

"Opportunities unlimited" is the appropriate slogan of the Job Corps training center, and it is diligently applied with the idea of enabling the boys to obtain gainful employment as a result of the training received there.

The center at Camp Parks is one of many such centers, others being located at different points over the Nation. Part of President Johnson's war on poverty program, the Job Corps was set up to train that segment of our youth who for one reason or another, have no place to go and no way to get there. Centers have been set up for both boys and girls.

Steelworker Editor Franceschini and this writer had the privilege of visiting the Camp Parks Center on December 9, therefore it is used as a case in point to illustrate the whole program.

Located not far from San Francisco, Camp Parks is a former Army base that has been reactivated for use by the Job Corps. It is operated for the Government by Litton Industries, Inc., educational systems division.

We spent the better part of a day touring the camp in the company of Mr. Gordon Lowe, who was most helpful and cooperative. To portray the fine work being done here is a very difficult task. One can hear or read about the wonderful work and accomplishment of these centers, but cannot come to full realization except by personal exposure. There is nothing more worthwhile than helping youngsters to help themselves, and the personnel of the camp is doing a tremendous job.

Boys come to this center from all over the country. They are under no obligation to remain, and can leave at any time. It is significant that only 18 percent do leave, and strong testimony that the boys are acutely aware of the opportunity they have.

The entrants range in age from 16 to 21, and their education level varies of course. Some of them cannot read. To remedy this, each boy receives 2½ hours per day instruc-

tion in basic education. The classes are arranged according to reading levels. This primary type of education enables many boys to pass Selective Service tests, and get into the Army. The vocational training equips them with a skill to get a job. Both of these encourage the boys to get further education on their own after finishing the Job Corps training. The boys may stay in the center up to 2 years and upon the satisfactory completion of training in one vocation may take up a second.

During the course of the day we visited most of the vocational schools, and the basic education classes. We visited with some of the boys in their rooms, and lunched with them in their dining hall.

I was impressed by the automotive school, and I guess a lot of the boys are, too, since it is one of the more popular vocations. Due, I guess, to the love that most young fellows have of tinkering with cars. But these boys weren't tinkering * * * they were learning. The school contains among other things, a complete auto body and paint shop, and there were autos in various stages of being rebuilt. Some of the kids were learning how to repair automatic transmissions (a formidable looking project).

The Volkswagen Co. set up a shop within the school to teach the boys how to repair their autos. The company installed all the equipment in this unit and sent their representatives in to instruct in the operation of it. In brief, the boys learn all facts of auto repair and maintenance here, under the careful supervision of competent instructors. This was true of all the vocational schools, as well as all other facilities.

We visited the electronics school, and watched the boys as they were learning basic theory and practical application. After learning the fundamentals of circuitry and soldering the boys are furnished with components, and learn from scratch, by assembling a complete radio. After it is completely wired and aligned, the boys are given a case in which to put it. Ergo, they have their own personal radio. I think this touch is most beneficial, since it gives a sense of accomplishment, that nothing else could impart.

Next was the typewriter repair shop, and as we went through this and saw typewriters in various stages of assembly or disassembly. I was amazed at the intricacy of the dad-blamed things. As Gene Houck, one of the instructors remarked, "People come through here, see this, and the first thing they say is * * * hmmm, I wonder if you could tell me what is wrong with my typewriter, it does this * * *."

In line with this is a plan, now forming, to teach the boys the intricate and much needed art of appliance repair and servicing.

After this came the school to teach the boys building maintenance, and it was here that we really received an eye opener. I don't think there was anything missed in the way of showing the boys what to do in the way of taking care of a building. I guess if one never took care of a building, then one really has no idea of just what is involved and required to do the job. It is so vast that I won't try to describe it * * * let it suffice to say that I have the greatest respect for building maintainers, henceforth and forevermore. So be it.

There is an arts and crafts shop that is a revelation. I say a revelation because it is here that boys with innate talent are given a chance to demonstrate it. Among the things taught here is painting, weaving, jewelry making, and ceramics. Some of the work produced by the boys is outstanding, and particularly the paintings I saw displayed.

One of the places we missed was the culinary arts school, but I imagine that it is on the same high level as all the others.

In the course of our travels, we visited the camp library. As we scanned the shelves, they seemed somewhat bare. In conversing with the librarian, we asked about this. This kindly woman fairly glowed as she told us of the large amount of books that were checked out, and of the interest the boys had in general reading and study. I personally feel that this is a real criteria of complete success. Once you get them interested in reading, they are halfway home on the road to success.

There are other fine activities and facilities provided for the boys. There is a spacious recreation hall with snack bar and tables. This is where the boys spend their free time in relaxation. It is closed during work and study periods. For the athletic minded there is a gym, also a ballfield and basketball court. The camp also has a theater, and the boys put out a remarkably fine newspaper. At this point I would like to extend compliments to one of the staff photographers of the paper. This is Maurice du Pont, who does some real tough photography.

At lunch with some of the boys we partook of a meal consisting of meat with tomato sauce, potatoes, broccoli, salad, and cake. There was a choice of beverages, coffee, tea, or milk. The meals are planned and nutritionally balanced. There are seconds available, if one is so inclined.

The camp is run on the honor system and the boys are self-policing. This is very effective, and makes the lads aware of their duties and responsibilities. Naturally they are under supervision, but in general terms, they are on their own.

A boy's room is his home and we were invited in to visit with some of them, where we were treated in a very hospitable manner. Since it is their home and therefore their castle, they are free to fix them up as they see fit. Of course it must be kept clean. This is the only restriction and this is the way it should be. Some of the boys are interested in landscaping, and have done some good work outside various buildings.

One thing that stood out in my mind throughout the entire day was this * * *. There is a vitality and enthusiasm in all the camp personnel, from administration to all the instructors. One senses instinctively that they are receiving great joy from their work, and getting a "big bang" from the knowledge that they are really doing a fine job helping these kids. What helps to uplift our youth is of extreme benefit to the whole Nation.

As the day progressed, we talked to many of the boys and it was both gratifying and heartwarming to hear the enthusiasm expressed about the Job Corps in general, and of the new lease on life they were obtaining from it. The frequent comment was that they realized it might be the last chance they could have to get a start in life on a more compatible basis with other people. Some of these kids have had it darn rough, and have seen more of the adverse side of life than they should have at their age, and it has instilled in them a knowing that they have to grasp this opportunity, and go from here. Life has taught them commonsense, and I look for great things in their future.

"For what good are pearls of wisdom, without the thread of commonsense to string them on."

LAST CHANCE TO BE SOMEBODY

A recent visit to the Youth Job Corps center located in Camp Parks, Calif., convinced me of the worthiness and necessity of the Job Corps. Contrary to what we read in the daily press, I witnessed firsthand the outstanding job being done to motivate and

reclaim individuals that would in all probability be social problems the rest of their lives. The corps takes service rejects, school dropouts, boys flirting with the law, lads so ill adjusted that it is impossible for them to hold steady jobs, and semi-illiterates.

These boys spend half of their corps day in school and the other half in on-the-job training. I joined them in their routine. Their conversations and actions unfolded a burning desire for a place in society, a willingness to learn, strong efforts to be mannerly and polite, and above all—motivation.

It is true the Job Corps fails with 30 percent of these boys, but the 70 percent that remain expressed their opinion of the Job Corps with the words: "Would you mess up your last chance to be somebody?"

Even if the percentages were reversed, the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," sure fits.

Just imagine what the cost would be in social and welfare dollars if these boys were allowed to drift into adulthood.

The Youth Job Corps must survive and be expanded to reach every eligible youth.

The Job Corps fulfills President Johnson's prophetic words, "We must make taxpayers out of people, not tax eaters."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ABERNETHY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, February 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2077. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educa-

tional and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the third special report of the Commission, pursuant to section 107, Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2078. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during January 1966, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2079. A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting the annual audit report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

2080. A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to section 14(b), Public Law 685, chapter 1036, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Judiciary.

2081. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of cost ascertainment for the fiscal year 1965, as authorized by 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1294. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 12169. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12958. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12959. A bill to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12960. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows who are now ineligible for such a pension; and to increase the rates of pension payable with respect to widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12962. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 12963. A bill to amend section 709(f) of title 32, United States Code, relating to contributions to retirement systems in the case of caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12964. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12965. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12966. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the Dis-

trict of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12967. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 12968. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 739. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

400. Mr. MOORE presented a memorial of the West Virginia Legislature relating to the importation of glassware from the Republic of Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12969. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vivona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 12970. A bill for the relief of Aristide G. Coletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12971. A bill for the relief of Teresina Mancini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12972. A bill for the relief of Adolf L. Vandendorpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

331. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to the impeachment of the Honorable Stephen S. Chandler, U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Right-To-Work Fight Misses the Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislative issues which have confronted Congress, few have stirred as much controversy as the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States authority to outlaw union shop agreements.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the text of an article which appeared in the February 26, 1966, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article sets forth a position that I have consistently taken throughout the debates on this subject:

THE RIGHT-TO-WORK FIGHT MISSES THE POINT
(By Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Few political struggles have raged so long and so bitterly as the battle over the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Since its enactment in 1947, thousands of fiery speeches have been lavished on this issue; election campaigns for high office have hinged on it; literally tons of propaganda, pro and con, have inundated lawmakers. Within the last year alone it has caused jammed hearing rooms, angry shouting matches and even a Senate filibuster.

As ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Subcommittee which handles this issue in the House, I have watched this emotional binge with growing dismay. In my view, right to work is a sham battle which too often ignores the issues. It is time we stopped tilting at windmills and faced facts.

The cause of the fuss, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, is only 44 words long. Simply stated, it allows each State to decide whether labor-management contracts within

its borders can require workers to join or pay dues to a union as a condition of employment. Today, 19 States exercise their authority to ban such agreements. Labor unions and their allies want to stop this by repealing 14(b) so that there would be no barrier to the union shop and many more companies could be organized with compulsory union membership. Most management groups are vehemently opposed.

The typical appeal for retaining 14(b) claims that compulsory unionism is somehow un-American—and therefore should not be sanctioned by Federal law. While many sincere people hold this opinion, I believe that they miss the point.

Obligatory membership is not necessarily so unusual or tragic. Many of the lawyers who urge on Congress the view that un-Americanism is somehow involved are themselves members of a compulsory union—the bar association. In 28 States, including my home State of Michigan, no attorney may practice in the courts without joining the bar association and paying dues. Like other attorneys, I have complied with this requirement since graduating from law school, and I have never felt that it corrupted my principles.

The vital question, I submit, is not whether I must join but whether and how my fundamental rights are affected when I do. An involuntary organization possesses extraordinary power since its members may not resign, or stop paying dues, without grave consequences. Thus, any such group should assume unusual responsibilities. As Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court has written, "If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression." A citizen should not be forced to choose between his job, the bread for his family—and his convictions.

My compulsory bar association would be un-American if it refused membership because of racial or religious bias, if it fined or expelled me for exercising the constitutional right to dissent, or if it used my dues money to support political candidates or political causes. In hard fact, these very practices are commonplace among labor unions. In my view, these are the central

issues that have been sidestepped throughout the discussions about the right-to-work section. That is why I insist that repeal of section 14(b) is acceptable if—and only if—it is accompanied by legal safeguards against the abuses of power by the unions.

While many labor unions are free of such abuses, many others are not. This was amply demonstrated last summer at hearings before our committee. While I believe these hearings were often directed to the wrong issues, they did uncover some shocking instances of union abuse of constitutional rights, including freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the right to equal employment opportunities.

C. F. Smith, a Texan, is a graduate engineer who passed his master electrician's examination in 1943 with an extremely high grade. For more than 20 years he has been a contractor, with a few other electricians in his employ. Many times over the years Smith and his employees have sought admission to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, but the local union in Houston would never accept them as members. To Smith the reason is obvious—he and his workers are Negroes.

In spite of his unsuccessful attempts to join, Smith has suffered for being nonunion. "The unions have picketed our jobs," Smith testified, "and a number of our clients have been harassed because they elected to use our services in lieu of union electrical contractors." Texas is a State with a right-to-work law. Smith's problems would undoubtedly be even worse if Texas permitted compulsory-membership contracts, unless effective safeguards made racial discrimination impossible.

The fact is that every serious study of the Nation's unions shows racial discrimination by unions to be widespread. Despite the new Civil Rights Act, there are still many lily-white locals. A recent national study showed that less than 1 percent of the apprentices in the building and construction trades are Negroes. Even in supposedly liberal New York State, the figure was reported to be only 2 percent.

Veilo Iacobucci, a movie projectionist from Upper Darby, Pa., was another witness before our committee. A veteran union member, he decided in 1962 to run against the president of his local on a reform platform. The

election was held under conditions which Iacobucci claimed were fraudulent. In any event, he was defeated. He was then summarily expelled from the union. Without membership, he is unable to work in most Philadelphia theaters. To ply his trade, he has had to buy an interest in a theater—using borrowed money—and hire himself as a projectionist.

Our committee learned that a local of the United Steel Workers had expelled two of its members after they filed and supported a petition to decertify the union as the bargaining agent with their employer—although the privilege of filing such a petition is guaranteed by our labor laws. Because of the union's action against them, the men lost their jobs under the union-shop contract. Clearly the right to democratic dissent is meaningless if you lose your job for exercising it.

The spending of union dues to aid political candidates is another outrageous practice which dilutes the citizenship rights of those compelled to pay union dues in order to work. Federal law forbids unions to contribute dues funds directly to support candidates for Federal office. But dues money is directly, and liberally, employed in non-Federal elections. It is also used indirectly in Federal elections.

When I asked witness Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the Teamsters, if union funds were used to support candidates for State and local offices, he expressed an attitude that is typical of many union leaders: "I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't."

The records of a major union, the United Auto Workers, were included in the hearings and provided further evidence of the abuse of the political freedoms of workers for whom union membership is compulsory. The report shows, for example, that in 1960 the UAW contributed to many campaigns. Some of the funds went to help Orville L. Freeman run for Governor of Minnesota, some to help Otto Kerner in his campaign for the Illinois governorship. Well over \$100,000 went to the union's voluntary political arm, the Committee on Political Education—COPE—which operates in Federal elections.

Even more dramatic is the plight of workers whose religious beliefs prevent them from joining an organization such as a labor union. For example, among the Plymouth Brethren, a fundamentalist sect, some members have lost job after job because they refused affiliation with a union. In many parts of the country there are such groups which are opposed to union membership as a matter of conscience. Their members constantly have trouble finding—and keeping—jobs.

Countless stories of this kind cry out the need for reform within the American labor movement and, more specifically, for an overhauling of the union-shop provisions of the law. A simple repeal of section 14(b) would undoubtedly increase the violation of constitutional rights, for union shops would quickly be organized in the States that now forbid them. On the other hand, the mere retention of right-to-work laws will not cure many of the abuses either.

My proposal, embodied in a bill I have introduced, would eliminate the section 14(b), thereby extending the privilege of negotiating union-shop contracts to unions in all 50 States—but at the same time safeguarding the rights of union members. This bill would make it unlawful for a union entering into an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment (1) to discriminate on account of race, color, or creed; (2) to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States; (3) to use dues or assessments for political or other nonunion purposes; (4) to cause the discharge of genuinely religious objectors to union membership.

Of course, it would be meaningless to recite fundamental individual rights without means for enforcement. Under my bill, a compulsory-membership clause in any collective-bargaining agreement would become void if the union involved should disregard any of the law's provisions.

Some of the problems of democratic rights in unions were faced in 1959 by the Landrum-Griffin labor-reform law, which I cosponsored in the House and which then-Senator John F. Kennedy sponsored in its Senate version. This was a valid first step, but experience since then proves that further steps are needed.

The basic safeguards I have outlined must be coupled with any repeal of section 14(b)—for the special privileges enjoyed by unions are linked both in fact and in the public view with special responsibilities. I am convinced that the American people would not long allow Federal sanction for compulsory membership in unions which abuse the rights of their members. This would amount to second-class citizenship for millions of workers. Before long the public would demand much stronger remedies—such as the application of antitrust laws to labor organizations.

It is high time to put aside the hollow clichés that permeate debate over this subject. It is time for all factions of industry to recognize that collective bargaining is a way of life in this country. And it is time for union leaders to recognize that special responsibilities must accompany union authority to require membership as a condition of employment. This, and not emotional arguments over the right to work, is the real issue in the right-to-work battle.

Blackmail in Home Rule Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to the press, a group calling itself the Free D.C. Movement was launched yesterday. It is apparently an

offshoot of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. One Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of SNCC in speaking for the new organization announced plans for a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule. The support demanded from Washington merchants will be to sign petitions, wire the President and Members of Congress, display a "Free D.C." sticker in the window of his business establishment and contribute financially to the treasury of the "Free D.C. Movement." Those who refuse to meet these demands will be blacklisted and boycotted. It is further reported that one cleric who has pledged support to the new movement said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but all other methods have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from the premise of one who is fundamentally opposed to home rule. However, I am shocked that the advocates of home rule are now going to resort to the unconscionable methods of blackmail recited above. This goes far beyond the legitimate pressures that should be applied to gain political ends. Steps such as those requiring people to sign petitions, to make financial contributions, and display window stickers are offensive to my sense of fair play. They violate freedom of conscience and the right to freely petition without duress. Indeed they are totally repugnant to the precepts of a free and open society. This kind of blackmail campaign is not going to win any friends for home rule among Members of Congress. It will be completely counterproductive and alienate support now existent.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that before we take up home rule legislation again perhaps we had better investigate the need for another type of legislation. Perhaps we should investigate the need to outlaw conspiracies to frighten, intimidate, and threaten under the guise of an economic boycott. This pernicious philosophy that the ends justify the means can be completely destructive of the fabric of a democratic society. Mr. Speaker, I do not like totalitarian and dictatorial methods even when practiced in defense of a good cause. And I repeat that I speak as one who is not opposed to home rule. The people who intend to resort to these tactics are a disgrace to the legitimate cause of home rule for the District of Columbia. They will fail as the forces which seek to employ tyrannical methods always fall when within the context of a democratic society they seek to substitute the weaponry of blackmail for the rule of reason.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frank W. Blackwelder, All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

Almighty and indestructible Heavenly Father, awaken our minds this day to the significance of the Lenten season.

As the word "lent" means "spring-time," so may our minds and spirits be renewed, reborn, and refreshed during this religious interval.

Allow this spiritual season to be both an interim of deleting wrong attitudes and of augmenting our lives with sound principles. Help us to remove the iner-

tia which impedes spiritual progress and to add to our natures evidences of increased devotion and loyalty to Thee.

May these 40 days of discipline of body, mind, and spirit enlighten, inspire, and stimulate our wills to serve Thee and magnify Thy glory.

We thank Thee for Thy servant, our beloved Chaplain, with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy